

By Mr. MOTT (for himself, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. EMERY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 12128. A bill to reduce the amount of paperwork required by Federal agencies and to increase congressional awareness of the increase in paperwork required by bills and joint resolutions under consideration by Congress; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

H.R. 12129. A bill to provide for improved controls over the labeling and inspection of meat and meat food products; and to enhance stability in the supply and price of meat and meat food products; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 12130. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to require that rehabilitation counselors hired under State plans approved under such act have certain minimum qualifications; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RISENHOOVER:

H.R. 12131. A bill to amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act to provide Federal grants for small public water systems to meet national primary drinking water regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. SHIPLEY):

H.R. 12132. A bill to end the authorization of the Helm Reservoir project, Skillet Fork, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 12133. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to prohibit restrictions on work rules in locations in which there is hunting, fishing, or shooting sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRAXLER:

H.R. 12134. A bill to defer from income certain amounts deferred pursuant to State or local public employee deferred compensation plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. NIX, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 12135. A bill to amend title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 for the purpose of providing rehabilitation grants to metropolitan cities

and urban counties; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WEISS, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 12136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against tax for the cost of removal of trees required by the United States or a State or local government to be removed to prevent the spread of a disease caused by pests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNETTE (for himself, Mr. HEFTTEL, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 12137. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that certain air traffic specialists be considered as air traffic controllers for retirement and certain other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12138. A bill to name a certain Federal building in Laguna Niguel, Calif., the "Chet Holifield Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 12139. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 12140. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide additional authorizations for certain operating programs under the act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOWNEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. TRENN):

H.R. 12141. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to clarify the act's coverage to employees engaged in the manufacture, repair, servicing, or sale of recreational boats; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARRIOTT (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. COCHRAN of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois, Mr. CORNWELL, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. ETEL, Mr. EVANS of Indiana, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, and Mrs. FENWICK):

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 19, 1978, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARRIOTT (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GAMMAGE, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HEFFNER, Mr. HEFTTEL, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. KEMP, Ms. KEYS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. LUNDINE):

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 19, 1978, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARRIOTT (for himself, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAHON, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. RISENHOOVER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIKES, Mrs. SMITH of NEBRASKA, Mr. SOLARZ and Mrs. SPELLMAN):

H.J. Res. 852. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 19, 1978 as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARRIOTT (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 19, 1978 as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.J. Res. 854. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution disapproving proposed regulations of the Department of the Treasury requiring centralized registration of firearms and other matters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. Res. 1131. Resolution providing for closed conference committee meetings on H.R. 5289; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. BONIOR introduced a bill (H.R. 12142) for the relief of Victor Manuel Romero, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ELECTRIC UTILITY FUEL ADJUSTMENTS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, during the recently completed Easter congressional

recess I traveled to every county in the Sixth Congressional District in order to meet with constituents and exchange views on a wide range of issues. While the people of central and western Maryland expressed concern over many different issues, clearly the issue most on the minds of the people of the Sixth District is the very large increases in electricity bills being experienced this spring due to the effects of the coal strike. De-

spite conscientious efforts by many citizens to conserve energy as much as possible, the electricity bills received this year have been staggering. I have received many complaints from constituents who have experienced electricity bills in excess of \$500 for the 2-month billing period. Some bills were even higher than \$1,000.

I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House have also heard from citi-

zens who find it very difficult to pay these unexpectedly high electric bills, which in many cases exceed the monthly mortgage payment. Understandably, citizens are upset over the effects of the fuel adjustment charges, which permit hundreds of dollars to be added to the total of the electric bill even though the actual usage of electricity might be lower than previous bills.

The House of Representatives addressed this issue last summer when we passed the National Energy Act, which contained a strong section on utility rate reform. Included in the bill were restrictions on the ability of Federal and State utility regulatory bodies to approve fuel adjustment charges.

The enormous increases in the fuel adjustment charges being experienced by the residents of central and western Maryland this year have convinced me that the fuel adjustment charge is unfair to citizens already burdened with inflation, taxes, and the high cost of all forms of energy. Therefore, on March 22, 1978, I introduced H.R. 11783 to prohibit the use of fuel adjustment charges in electricity pricing systems. This bill would ban fuel adjustment charges from all electric rates, whether the electricity is subject to regulation by a Federal or State utility regulatory agency. The present Federal and State utility regulatory structure would be retained. The bill stipulates that all rates for electricity must be established in advance only after full public hearings which guarantee the opportunities for participation by the public in the ratemaking process. I invite the support of other Members of Congress in cosponsoring this legislation.

At the beginning of the 95th Congress in January 1977, I appointed a task force on energy made up of citizens representing a cross section of Maryland's Sixth Congressional District. These citizens met frequently last year, reviewed the national energy plan in detail, and submitted recommendations to me on energy policy and its impact on the people of central and western Maryland. The majority of the members of the task force feel that there is a need for utility rate reform on a Federal level and their views have been very helpful to me in studying the effect of fuel adjustment clauses and in preparing this legislation. I am very grateful for the guidance of the thousands of constituents who have written to me on this subject, called me, attended one of the energy town meetings I held last year, or dropped by to visit with me to express their views with respect to this issue. I am indebted to each of the members of the energy task force; the cochairpersons are Sylvia Hancock and Barry Teach and the other members are Harry Berry, John Estes, Robert Gentry, John Hose, William McClean, and Joseph Sottile.

I think it is important to note that the Maryland General Assembly has recently passed legislation to protect utility consumers by limiting the ability of utility companies to pass increased fuel costs directly on to consumers and by

strengthening the role of the Maryland Public Service Commission in reviewing increased fuel expenses and other practices of the utility companies. I commend the members of the Maryland General Assembly for their action and feel it underscores the important responsibilities of State government in the field of utility rate regulation. The Federal Government is very restricted in its ability to help individual citizens cope with high utility bills unless the State public service commissions also take strong action to effectively regulate public utilities.

Because of the tremendous increases in the cost of energy in recent years, the Federal Government must become more sensitive to the difficulties created for many citizens by our present utility regulatory practices. The House of Representatives recognized this fact last year when we approved the National Energy Act. The bill I have introduced, H.R. 11783, would further protect the interests of consumers by banning the use of fuel adjustment clauses in electric rate structures and mandating greater public participation in decisions affecting electricity rates. I would like to include a copy of this bill in the RECORD at this time. I would welcome the comments and questions of other Members of Congress who would like additional information about this bill or who may wish to cosponsor it.

A copy of the bill is inserted at this point:

H.R. 11783

A bill to prohibit fuel adjustment clauses in electric utility rate schedules

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PROHIBITION OF FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSES AND SUMMARY, EX PARTE RATEMAKING PROCEDURES

SECTION 1. (a) All utility rate schedules and parts thereof made lawful by a regulatory authority shall provide for the sale of electric energy at prices which have been subject to and ordered into effect after prior public notice and full hearing by the regulatory authority.

(b) As used in this section:

(1) The term "Commission" means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) The term "consumer" means any person, State agency, or Federal agency, to which electric energy is sold other than for purposes of resale.

(3) The term "hearing" means, in the case of a State regulatory authority, a proceeding (A) which includes notice to, and an opportunity for, participants to present direct and rebuttal evidence and a written decision based upon evidence appearing in the record of the proceeding, and (B) which is subject to review in accordance with the laws of each State. In the case of a Federal regulatory authority, such terms mean a proceeding on the record after agency hearing.

(4) The term "Federal agency" means any agency or instrumentality of the United States; but does not include the District of Columbia.

(5) The term "Federal regulatory authority" means any Federal agency which has ratemaking authority with respect to the sale of electric energy by any utility.

(6) The term "rate" means any rate,

charge, or classification made, demanded, observed, or received with respect to sale of electric energy, any rule, regulation, or practice respecting any such rate, charge, or classification and any contract pertaining to the sale of electric energy.

(7) The term "ratemaking authority" means authority to fix, modify, approve, or disapprove rates.

(8) The term "rate schedule" means the rates which a utility charges consumers.

(9) The term "regulatory authority" means a State regulatory authority or a Federal regulatory authority. A State agency or a Federal agency which is a utility and which has ratemaking authority with respect to its own rates shall be treated as a regulatory authority only to the extent that no other regulatory authority has ratemaking authority with respect to such rates.

(10) The term "sale" includes an exchange of, or a charge for transmission of, electric energy.

(11) The term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia.

(12) The term "State agency" means any agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof.

(13) The term "State regulatory authority" means any State agency which has ratemaking authority with respect to the sale of electric energy by any utility.

(14) The term "utility" means any person, corporation, State agency, or Federal agency, which sells electric energy.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 2. (a) No utility may sell electric energy except in accordance with a rate schedule which has been fixed, approved, or allowed to go into effect by a regulatory authority. No regulatory authority may fix, approve, or allow to go into effect any rate schedule which violates section 1.

(b) If any person alleges that a regulatory authority's action, or failure to act, violates subsection (a)—

(1) in the case of a regulatory authority which is a Federal regulatory authority (or which is a State regulatory authority whose action or failure to act is not reviewable by a State of competent jurisdiction), such person may obtain review of such action or failure to act, insofar as it relates to a violation of subsection (a)—

(A) in any statutory review proceeding which is otherwise applicable to such action or failure to act, or

(B) if there is no such statutory review proceeding applicable to such action or failure to act, by commencing a civil action in the United States court of appeals for any circuit in which the utility sells electric energy, which court shall have jurisdiction to review such determination in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) in the case of a regulatory authority which is a State regulatory authority, such action, or failure to act, insofar as it relates to a violation of subsection (a)—

(A) may be reviewed by any State court of competent jurisdiction, and

(B) if such action is reviewable by such a State court, may not be reviewed by any court of the United States, except by the United States Supreme Court on writ of certiorari in accordance with section 1257 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) If (but this subsection) no regulatory authority has ratemaking authority with respect to a utility, a Commission shall have ratemaking authority with respect to such utility for purposes of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall take effect six months after the date of enactment of this Act. ●

FOREIGN STEEL DUMPING

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, while there is in my opinion ample evidence of the "dumping" of steel by foreign steel companies, for those who still are not convinced, the following article from the Sydney Morning Herald offers ample proof. And, it comes straight from the financial editor of one of Australia's leading newspapers, the Sydney Morning Herald in discussing the finances of BHP (Broken Hill Proprietary Co., Ltd.) a leading Australian steel producer:

BY ALL ACCOUNTS STEEL'S THE LOSER

(By Malcolm Wilson, Financial Editor)

It will now take a very major effort indeed for BHP to climb out of the deep hole into which it has fallen on its steel operations.

Steel continues to be BHP's big problem area and whichever way you prefer to do the accounting on the steel operations the result was a lot worse in the six months to November, 1977, compared with the previous corresponding period.

Yes, again, we find that the company has incurred a big loss on its steel operations. Using BHP's accounting methods, the loss was \$35 million in the six months to November compared with a loss of \$21.6 million in the previous corresponding period.

Adopting the more widely used accounting methods (which are less severe as far as depreciation is concerned) the company would have shown a profit on its steel operations of \$10.5 million but even this would have been half the previous profit of the previous period of \$20.6 million.

The figures in the table below tell the real story of BHP's lacklustre profit performance in recent years. Looking at the domestic sales figures for the November six months period, we see that these figures have fallen significantly over the last three periods.

PROGRESSIVE FALL

Whereas local steel sales were, 2,490 million tons in the six months to November, 1974, the corresponding figures have fallen progressively to 2,167 million tons, then 1,986 million tons and now only 1,860 million tons.

While these steel sales to the Australian market are presumably priced to return BHP a good profit, the reduced steel demand has forced BHP to sell more and more of its steel on the export market.

The problem here is that just about every other steel producer in the world has been facing the same situation of declining demand in its own domestic market, there is a substantial surplus of steel available.

JUST COVERS COST

In order to clinch an export sale, BHP has had to pitch its price so low that it only just covers its marginal operating costs.

So there must be just about no profits at all in BHP's steel exports. And the table shows how these exports have risen in recent years to help maintain an overall steel production level at the rate of around 6 million tons a year.

In this situation, it is apparent that nothing would please BHP more than a resurgence of the Australian economy, as this would enable it to increase its sales in the domestic market and reduce them on the export market.

If this were to happen, BHP would gain significantly from the better prices it can get on the Australian market.

As it is, BHP appears to be in a good cash situation at the moment. Its cash flow after dividend payments increased to \$147.4 million for the six-month period compared with \$125.2 million in the previous corresponding period.

The company says that the continuing strength of the group's cash flow means that the group's liquidity has been maintained at a satisfactory level.

BHP'S STEEL SALES

('000 tonnes)

	6 months to	Exports	Domestic sales	Total
Nov. '74.....	835		2,490	3,325
May '75.....	1,008		2,125	3,133
Nov. '75.....	1,273		2,167	3,440
May '76.....	1,277		1,894	3,171
Nov. '76.....	1,573		1,986	3,559
May '77.....	1,204		1,773	2,977
Nov. '77.....	1,471		1,860	3,331

QUAKERS URGE DISARMAMENT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following statement by the Friends World Committee of Consultation on the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament. I hope it stimulates discussion on this subject. For disarmament deserves earnest and deep consideration by our Nation and the other nations of the world. It is my belief that all nations should strive toward disarmament.

The statement follows:

FRIENDS WORLD COMMITTEE FOR CONSULTATION, RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS (QUAKERS), FEBRUARY 21, 1978

The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) with members in 27 countries, in expressing the belief in the value of every human being in the sight of God, has throughout its 300 years' history consistently worked for peace and against war and the preparations for it.

The escalation in the arms race and the increased destructiveness of modern weapons make the need for disarmament more imperative than ever before. The high level of armaments, held by most governments to be essential to security, is instead a major threat to peace. Armaments are also a tragic waste of human and material resources which should be used towards removing the extreme poverty in which most of the world's people still live. Effective disarmament agreements must be accompanied by other measures such as strengthening procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes through the United Nations, developing international law and guaranteeing basic human rights.

The Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament to be held in New York in May/June 1978 is an historic opportunity for governments and peoples not only to proclaim the urgency of disarmament, but also to commit themselves to practical steps of disarmament and to ending the international trade in arms. Any government can take the initiative. We call on them to do so. The risks of disarmament are no greater than

the risks of war. We urge that the Special Session should be used as a turning point for governments to respond to the yearning of people everywhere for a world free from war.●

POMONA GRANGE SPEAKS OUT AGAINST GUN REGISTRATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, members of the Pomona Grange of Coshocton, Ohio, have gone on record against the gun registration efforts of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. In a letter to BATF Director Rex Davis, they declared they "are adamantly opposed not only to the idea of gun registration but also to the processes whereby gun controls are presently being used to force gun registration upon the people of the United States of America."

I agree wholeheartedly with their views. I am currently sponsoring a joint resolution disapproving the proposed BATF plan.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the full text of the Pomona Grange letter:

WEST LAFAYETTE, OHIO,
April 5, 1978.

Director REX DAVIS,
Director of Alcohol, Tobacco & Fire Arms
Division, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DIRECTOR DAVIS: The Coshocton County Pomona Grange of Coshocton, Ohio hereby emphatically declares that its members are adamantly opposed not only to the idea of gun registration but also to the processes whereby gun controls are presently being used to force gun registration upon the people of the United States of America. Our Government is One Of The People, By The People, and For The People. Any rule, regulation, or law that is forced upon the people without the consent of the majority must be rejected.

Our elected representatives and appointed members of Government apparently see themselves as the Great Protective Father. This is a false idea. Any one who truly believes in our Representative Republic must know that you build character and responsibility in people by requiring that they shoulder their own problems by cooperative action in times of need.

Over protective governments build weak citizens and is the direct cause of the downfall of former governments. We only need to look at the history of past nations to see the results of ambitious governments. Let's not follow the example of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

Gun registration must not be dictated by some government individual bureau, or department. After all, it is not the majority of citizens that are using guns wrongly. It is the duty of government to control only the ones who use guns for the wrong purposes. When the laws, now on the books can be truly enforced, there will be no need for further limiting the freedom of law abiding citizens.

It is true that guns wrongly used kill many people but so do automobiles, drugs and alcohol, knives, clubs, electricity, and many other devices. We must not, in a freedom loving country, deny the people the free

choice of the benefits of these devices just because a small percent of the citizens are let go unpunished when they use them wrongly.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN C. LAPP,
Legislative Agent.
LLOYD J. FOWLER,
Legislative Agent.
ROBERT F. MCCLURE,
Master.●

DEREGULATION DEBATE SHROUDED IN SECRECY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. David Cohen, president of Common Cause, which called attention to the manner in which the Democratic Caucus has disregarded the intent of House rules concerning open conferences on the natural gas deregulation issue.

Mr. Cohen's comments are of particular importance at this time because of the gravity of the issue at stake, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

Certainly they reflect my own feelings on this issue of open meetings—as well as the continuing issue of how this energy legislation has been handled by the majority.

The letter follows:

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ARCHER: Common Cause strongly believes that the natural gas pricing conferences held after the Easter recess should be held in open session, as was the March 22 conference.

Common Cause has been concerned that the House and Senate Democratic conferees for a three month period chose to ignore House and Senate rules and exclude the public from critical deliberations and conduct its conferences in secret.

It is our understanding that these closed meetings were dealing with the heart of the natural gas pricing question and that substantive actions were being taken—offers made, counter-offers proposed, and decisions reached that will vitally affect every segment of American society. To conduct these sessions in secret is a clear violation of the public's right to know and totally contravenes the open meeting rules of the House and Senate.

Since the passage of strong Sunshine rules, open meetings in both the House and Senate have become a natural and productive way of doing business. A Common Cause study showed that in the first year after passage of the House open meetings rule in 1973, over 90% of House markups were open to the public. Although no similar statistics exist for the Senate, it is clear to those who follow the Senate that the closed meeting is the rare exception to a general rule of openness. In addition, both Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives have adopted rules opening their party caucuses to public observation.

The House rule governing open conferences states that all conferences must be open to the public unless a majority of the entire House votes to close the conference. The Sen-

ate rule requires open conferences unless a majority of the managers votes on the record in open session to close a conference.

Clearly these procedures have been flouted by Democrats meeting in closed conferences on the energy bill. The reason cited is that these meetings are not conferences but simply "Democratic Caucuses" where members meet for casual consulting. This claim is spurious, for major substantive issues were being discussed by Members of the two Houses of Congress, compromises formally offered and counter-offers discussed and debated. In fact, the future natural gas policy for the United States is being shaped, debated and probably decided in these secret so-called "Democratic Caucuses."

If these conferences are held in secret after the Easter recess, this basic violation of House and Senate rules places the entire bill in jeopardy. If rules are violated and proper procedures are ignored, points of order can legitimately be lodged against the legislation.

We strongly urge you to hold any future conferences on energy in open session. Controversial and sensitive matters are decided in public every day in Congress. This matter should not be treated any differently.

Sincerely,

DAVID COHEN,
President.●

TRIBUTE TO CARPENTER'S UNION ED GALE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1978 hundreds of friends of Ed Gale will gather in San Jose, Calif., to honor him on the occasion of his retirement. Congressman MINETA and I feel that it is appropriate at this time to note the years of service which Ed Gale has dedicated both to the carpenter's union and to the community in which he lives.

Ed has served the carpenter's union in San Jose since 1946 in a variety of capacities, including business agent, financial secretary, recording secretary, and on countless committees. He has lent his efforts to encouraging and assisting young people through the Carpenter's Apprentice Committee and toiled for work place safety through his position as chairman of the Labor Committee of the Governor's Safety Conference Committee from 1965 to 1972. He has also worked for safety as a member of the planning committee for the Occupational Safety Conference of San Jose State University.

Ed has been a worker for human rights and brotherhood as a member of the San Jose Human Relations Commission from 1959 to 1965, and serves with a large number of fraternal, community, and civic organizations.

Ed Gale epitomizes the sort of commitment to trade unionism, community, family, and good government that makes our country vibrant and healthy. We owe him a round of thanks and both Congressman MINETA and I are pleased to recognize him and applaud him on the occasion of his retirement.●

CONGRESSMAN FOLEY'S VOTING RECORD

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit a compilation of my voting record for the month of March of the 2d session of the 95th Congress:

75. H J Res 554. D.C. Voting Representation. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1048) providing for House floor consideration of the joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for full voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. Adopted 386-21 March 1, 1978. Yes.

76. H J Res 554. D.C. Voting Representation. Edwards, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for full voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. Motion agreed to 369-15 March 1, 1978. Yes.

77. H J Res 554. D.C. Voting Representation. Edwards, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for full voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. Motion agreed to 394-12 March 2, 1978. Yes.

78. H J Res 554. D.C. Voting Representation. Passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for full voting representation in Congress (both in the House and the Senate) and to retain the right granted by the 23rd Amendment to vote for the election of the president and vice president (the resolution would repeal the 23rd Amendment). Passed 289-127 March 2, 1978. Yes.

79. Procedural Motion. Bauman, R-Md., motion to approve the House Journal for Thursday, March 2, 1978. Motion agreed to 304-20 March 3, 1978. Announced yes.

80. H Res 957. Veterans' Affairs Committee. Adoption of the resolution to authorize \$400,000 for calendar year 1978 for expenses of investigations and studies of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Adopted 336-1 March 3, 1978. Yes.

81. H Res 953. District of Columbia Committee. Adoption of the resolution to authorize \$275,000 for calendar year 1978 for expenses of investigations and studies of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. Adopted 318-15 March 3, 1978. Yes.

82. H Res 1012. Rules Committee. Adoption of the resolution to authorize \$49,500 for calendar year 1978 for expenses of investigations and studies of the House Committee on Rules. Adopted 321-13 March 3, 1978. Yes.

83. Procedural Motion. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, motion to approve the House Journal for Friday, March 3, 1978. Motion agreed to 331-11 March 6, 1978. Announced yes.

84. H J Res 715. Sun Day Designation. Lehman, D-Fla., motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to designate May 3, 1978, as "Sun Day" to promote and call attention to the possibilities of solar energy. Motion agreed to 348-7. March 6, 1978. Announced yes.

85. HR 10551. Education Act Walver. Perkins, D-Ky., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to continue fiscal 1978 funding and waive some requirements of Title I of the 1974 Elementary and Secondary Education Act for 13 school districts that participated in demonstration programs to improve operation of Title I programs. Motion agreed to 404-0. March 7, 1978. Yes.

86. HR 11180. Debt Limit. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1056) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to increase the debt limit and revise procedures for establishing it in the future. Adopted 285-115. March 7, 1978. Yes.

87. HR 11180. Debt Limit. Bolling, D-Mo., amendment to delete title II, which would establish the debt limit through concurrent budget resolutions in the future. Adopted 277-132. March 7, 1978. Yes.

88. HR 11180. Debt Limit. Passage of the bill to increase the debt limit to \$824 billion through March 1, 1979. Rejected 165-248. March 7, 1978. Yes.

89. H J Res 746. Power Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1978. Passage of the joint resolution to appropriate \$13.1 million for the operation of the Southwestern Power Administration for fiscal 1978. Passed 353-50. March 7, 1978. Yes.

90. H Res 1003. Public Works and Transportation Committee. Adoption of the resolution to authorize \$2 million for calendar year 1978 for expenses of investigations and studies of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Adopted 399-1. March 7, 1978. Yes.

91. Procedural Motion. Bauman, R-Md., demand for the yeas and nays on the question of dispensing with further proceedings under a quorum call. Proceedings dispensed with 372-34. March 8, 1978. Yes.

92. Procedural Motion. Dickinson, R-Ala., motion to approve the House *Journal* of Tuesday, March 7, 1978. Motion agreed to 377-26. March 8, 1978. Yes.

93. Procedural Motion. Bolling, D-Mo., motion to table the Zablocki, D-Wis., motion to reconsider the vote approving the *Journal*. Motion agreed to 313-91. March 8, 1978. Yes.

94. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Rousset, R-Calif., demand for the yeas and nays on the Bolling, D-Mo., motion to order the previous question on the adoption of the rule (H. Res. 1057), providing for House floor consideration of the bill to promote full employment, balanced growth and price stability by economic planning and employment programs. Motion agreed to 371-36. March 8, 1978. Yes.

95. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 1057) providing for House floor consideration of the bill. Adopted 349-58. March 8, 1978. Yes.

96. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Bolling, D-Mo., motion to table the Long, D-La., motion to reconsider the vote adopting the rule providing for House floor consideration of the bill. Motion agreed to 368-29. March 8, 1978. Yes.

97. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Hawkins, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill to promote full employment, balanced growth and price stability. Motion agreed to 364-32. March 8, 1978. Yes.

98. Procedural Motion. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, motion to approve the House *Journal* of Wednesday, March 8, 1978. Motion agreed to 386-15. March 9, 1978. Yes.

99. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Wright, D-Texas, amendments, to the Sarasin, R-Conn., amendments, to require the president, beginning with the third year after enactment of the bill, to include in his annual economic report goals for reasonable price stability, and to formulate policies to reduce inflation. Adopted 277-143. March 9, 1978. Yes.

100. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Jeffords, R-Vt., substitute amendment, to the Sarasin, R-Conn., amendments, to require the president, beginning with the third year after passage of the bill, to include in his annual economic report goals for reasonable price stability, and to formulate policies for the reduction of inflation; and to define reason-

able price stability as reduction of inflation to 3 percent within five years of enactment. Rejected 198-223. March 9, 1978. No.

101. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Jeffords, R-Vt., amendment to require the president's economic report to differentiate between employment in the private and permanent public sector and employment in temporary public service programs. Adopted 239-177. March 9, 1978. No.

102. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Quile, R-Minn., amendment to include maintenance of farm income at 100 percent of parity at the marketplace among the goals of the president's economic report. Adopted 264-150. March 9, 1978. Yes.

103. HR 10982. First Budget Rescission, Fiscal 1978. Passage of the bill to rescind \$55,255,000 in fiscal 1978 appropriations: \$40,200,000 in military assistance; \$10,055,000 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and \$5,000,000 in international peacekeeping activities. Passed 318-0. March 10, 1978. Yes.

104. HR 6635. Retirement Bond Interest. Conable, R-N.Y., demand for a second on the Ullman, D-Ore., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to allow the interest rates paid on U.S. retirement plan and individual retirement bonds to be increased to the rate paid on U.S. series E savings bonds. Second ordered 372-1. March 13, 1978. Yes.

105. HR 7814. Federal Employees' Flexible Work Schedules. Solarz, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize federal agencies to experiment with flexible and compressed work schedules. Motion rejected 242-141. March 13, 1978. Yes.

106. HR 10126. Federal Employees' Part-Time Employment. Schroeder, D-Colo., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a program to increase part-time career employment within the U.S. Civil Service. Motion agreed to 294-84. March 13, 1978. Yes.

107. HR 9146. Postal Service Changes. Hanley, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide for a one-house congressional veto within 60 days of proposed postal service changes submitted by the U.S. Postal Service. Motion agreed to 371-6. March 13, 1978. Yes.

108. H Res 1010. Judiciary Committee Funding. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, motion to recommit the resolution to the House Administration Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment requiring that \$300,000 of the \$1,482,805 provided for the committee by the resolution for the remainder of the 95th Congress be earmarked for the committee's internal security functions. Motion rejected 161-216. March 13, 1978. No.

109. H Res 956. Assassinations Committee Funding. Bauman, R-Md., motion to recommit the resolution to the House Administration Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment cutting funding for the committee to \$600,000, from \$2.5 million, and instructing the House Administration Committee to justify further funding for the Select Committee on Assassinations. Motion rejected 182-198. March 13, 1978. No.

110. H Res 956. Assassinations Committee Funding. Adoption of the resolution providing \$2.5 million for the activities of the House Select Committee on Assassinations for the remainder of the 95th Congress. Adopted 204-175. March 13, 1978. Yes.

111. Procedural Motion. Michel, R-Ill., demand for the yeas and nays on the Sisk, D-Calif., motion that the House dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call. Motion agreed to 331-72. March 14, 1978. Yes.

112. Procedural Motion. Bauman, R-Md., motion that the House *Journal* for Monday, March 13, 1978, be read in full. Motion rejected 99-301. March 14, 1978. No.

113. Procedural Motion. Foley, D-Wash.,

motion to approve the House *Journal* for Monday, March 13, 1978. Motion agreed to 371-29. March 14, 1978. Yes.

114. Procedural Motion. Foley, D-Wash., motion to table the Edwards, R-Okla., motion to reconsider the previous vote. Motion agreed to 308-91. March 14, 1978. Yes.

115. S 1671. Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. Johnson, R-Colo., demand for a second on the Roncallo, D-Wyo., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate 904,500 acres of the Custer and Gallatin National Forests in Montana as the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. Second ordered 380-20. March 14, 1978. Yes.

116. HR 810. Government Officials' Travel Expenses. Conable, R-N.Y., demand for a second on the Ullman, D-Ore., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit private foundations to pay foreign travel expenses of government officials under certain circumstances. Second ordered 387-2. March 14, 1978. Yes.

117. HR 2028. Home Production of Beer and Wine. Conable, R-N.Y., demand for a second on the Ullman, D-Ore., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit individuals aged 18 and older to produce limited quantities of beer and wine for personal and family use without incurring excise taxes or penalties. Second ordered 388-3. March 14, 1978. Yes.

118. S 1671. Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. Roncallo, D-Wyo., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to include 904,500 acres of national forest lands in the National Wilderness Preservation System and designate it the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness. Motion agreed to 405-7. March 14, 1978. Yes.

119. HR 810. Government Officials' Travel Expenses. Ullman, D-Ore., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit private foundations to pay foreign travel expenses of government officials under certain circumstances. Motion agreed to 372-38. March 14, 1978. Yes.

120. HR 3813. Redwood Park Expansion. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to provide for the immediate expansion of the Redwood National Park in northern California by 48,000 acres. Adopted 317-60. March 14, 1978. Yes.

121. Procedural Motion. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, motion to approve the House *Journal* of Tuesday, March 14, 1978. Motion agreed to 387-15. March 15, 1978. Yes.

122. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Hawkins, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill to promote full employment, balanced growth and price stability. Motion agreed to 380-19. March 15, 1978. Yes.

123. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, amendment to the Baucus, D-Mont., substitute for the Ashbrook amendment to the bill. The Ashbrook amendment to the Baucus substitute would provide alternative language for the original Ashbrook amendment to the bill. Both Ashbrook amendments aimed to achieve a balanced federal budget within five years. Rejected 205-215. March 15, 1978. Paired against.

124. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Baucus, D-Mont., substitute, to the Ashbrook, R-Ohio, amendment, to declare that one of the purposes of the act is achievement of a balanced budget consistent with achievement of the unemployment goals enumerated in the bill. Adopted 411-3. March 15, 1978. Yes.

125. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Hawkins, D-Calif., motion to end debate at 5:45 p.m. on Title I of the bill and all amendments thereto. Motion agreed to 237-170. March 15, 1978. Yes.

126. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Quile, R-Minn., amendment to make specified permanent reductions in individual and corporate taxes a medium-term goal to be included

in the first Economic Report submitted by the president following enactment of the bill. Rejected 194-216: March 15, 1978. No.

127. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Hawkins, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to further consider the bill to promote full employment, balanced growth and price stability. Motion agreed to 379-8: March 16, 1978. Yes.

128. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Jeffords, R-Vt., amendment to make removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped one of the explicit national priorities under the bill. Adopted 398-0: March 16, 1978. Yes.

129. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Pike, D-N.Y., amendment to exclude from the measurement of unemployment used under the bill persons unemployed because of strikes, those who have been unemployed less than four weeks, those who have jobs waiting but for their own convenience are not ready to enter employment, those who are not seeking full-time work, and those who voluntarily left their last jobs. Rejected 199-204: March 16, 1978. No.

130. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Wiggins, R-Calif., motion to strike the enacting clause and thus kill the bill. Motion rejected 106-310: March 16, 1978. No.

131. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Ashbrook, R-Ohio, amendment to require the president, in carrying out the purposes of the act, to consider the impact of all the provisions of the U.S. Code and Code of Federal Regulations on the national economy. Rejected 114-296: March 16, 1978. Announced no.

132. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Conable, R-N.Y., amendment, to the Rules Committee substitute to Title III of the bill, to permit the Joint Economic Committee to submit an amendment recommending economic goals to the first annual concurrent resolution on the budget, eliminating provisions that would permit the joint committee to report its own concurrent resolution each year. Adopted 259-153: March 16, 1978. Yes.

133. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Bauman, R-Md., amendment to terminate the provisions of the act Sept. 30, 1983, unless extended beyond that date by act of Congress. Rejected 196-216: March 16, 1978. Yes.

134. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Quile, R-Minn., substitute for the bill to set as national goals 4 percent unemployment and 3 percent inflation rates, 100 percent of parity in farm prices, a reduction in tax levels and a balanced federal budget; to prohibit use of public service jobs to meet the unemployment goal; and to establish a presidential task force on youth unemployment. Rejected 137-276: March 16, 1978. No.

135. HR 50. Full Employment Act. Passage of the bill to promote full employment, balanced growth and price stability. Passed 257-152: March 16, 1978. Yes.

136. HR 11274. Middle-Income Student Assistance. Erlenborn, R-Ill., demand for a second on the Ford, D-Mich., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to expand educational grant and loan programs for middle-income students. Second not ordered. 156-218: March 20, 1978. Yes.

137. H. Res. 996. International Relations Committee Funding. Adoption of the resolution to provide \$375,000 for the expenses of investigations and studies by the International Relations Subcommittee on International Organizations through Oct. 31, 1978. Adopted 367-13: March 20, 1978. Yes.

138. HR 7700. Postal Service Act. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1078) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to reorganize the United States Postal Service. Adopted 387-0: March 20, 1978. Yes.

139. H Res 1082. Aldo Moro Kidnaping. Adoption of the resolution to condemn the terrorist kidnaping of former Italian Premier Aldo Moro on March 16, 1978, and to express the sense of the House that the president press for consideration of antiterrorism

measures by the United Nations. Adopted 398-0; March 21, 1978. Yes.

140. HR 11518. Debt Limit Extension. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1092) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to extend the public debt limit. Adopted 314-80; March 21, 1978. Yes.

141. HR 11518. Debt Limit Extension. Passage of the bill to extend the public debt limit at its existing level of \$752 billion through July 31, 1978. Passed 233-172; March 21, 1978. Yes.

142. HR 11315. Campaign Financing. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1093) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act, last amended in 1976, and to permit a floor amendment on the public financing of House general election campaigns. Rejected 198-209; March 21, 1978. Yes.

143. HR 5383. Mandatory Retirement Age. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to raise to 70, from 65, the age limit for protection of non-federal workers from age-based discriminatory practices, including mandatory retirement (except for certain high-level executives and tenured college and university faculty), and to eliminate the upper limit for most civilian federal employees. Adopted 391-6; March 21, 1978. Yes.

144. HR 7700. Postal Service Act. C. Wilson, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill to reorganize the United States Postal Service. Motion agreed to 364-2; March 21, 1978. Announced yes.

145. H J Res 796. Disaster Relief Appropriations, Fiscal 1978. Passage of the joint resolution to appropriate \$300 million for the remainder of fiscal 1978 for disaster relief programs caused by the severe winter weather conditions throughout the country. Passed 393-4; March 22, 1978. Yes.

146. HR 9518. Shipping Act Amendments. Adoption of the rule (H Res 1074) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to increase the penalties for illegal merchant marine rebating and to expedite the enforcement of the rebating laws. Adopted 365-33; March 22, 1978. Yes.

147. HR 9518. Shipping Act Amendments. Murphy, D-N.Y., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill to increase the penalties for illegal merchant marine rebating and to expedite the enforcement of the rebating laws. Adopted 376-0; March 22, 1978. Yes.

148. HR 9518. Shipping Act Amendments. Passage of the bill to increase the penalties for illegal merchant marine rebating and to expedite the enforcement of the rebating laws. Passed 390-1; March 22, 1978. Yes.

149. HR 6782. Emergency Farm Bill. Foley, D-Wash., motion to disagree with Senate amendments attaching emergency farm aid provisions to the House raisin promotion bill, and request a conference with the Senate. Motion agreed to 332-63; March 22, 1978. Yes.

150. HR 6782. Emergency Farm Bill. Foley, D-Wash., motion to table the Moore, D-La., motion to instruct House conferees to support a Senate amendment providing a flexible parity program of graduated target prices for wheat, corn and cotton for 1978. Motion agreed to 224-167; March 22, 1978. Yes. ●

STRUTHERS HIGH SCHOOL WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM WINS CLASS AAA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend of March 31, 1978, the city of

Struthers, Ohio, was elated as over 3,000 citizens turned out to greet the Struthers High School Wildcats basketball team as the 1978 class AAA girls' Ohio State champions.

The Struthers Wildcats, cocaptained by Bonnie Beachy and Patty Fitzpatrick, defeated the Middletown High School girls' basketball team 53-51 at St. John's Arena in Columbus, to win the Ohio State AAA girls' basketball championship. With 23 straight wins and a 25-1 record, the Struthers team ended the season on a festive note, with a public celebration held on Sunday, April 1, 1978.

At the Sunday post-game rally, Mayor Centofante praised the team and presented Wildcats' Head Coach Dick Prest with a city proclamation. In addition, Struthers High School was presented with a commemorative resolution by Mahoning County Commissioner Tom Barrett. The Ohio General Assembly will present a commemorative resolution to individual team members.

The team is cocaptained by two outstanding players. The first is Bonnie Beachy, who was elected most valuable player in the AAA tourney at Columbus. Cocaptain Patty Fitzpatrick was chosen for the all-tournament team.

In their remarks, Beachy and Fitzpatrick stressed that the Wildcats' success was due to a real team effort, and that the close-knit team spirit extends beyond the court, too. Becky Hanna, a team member, reflected this spirit when she commented:

We're all friends. We all do things together. The love we have is genuine.

In addition, the team was further honored by a special school assembly. The Youngstown Vindicator of April 7, 1978, reported this event as follows:

STRUTHERS GIRLS FETED AT SCHOOL

It was a "banner day" today at Struthers High School as the newly-crowned State Class AAA girls' basketball champions were honored during a morning assembly.

Trophies, banners and proclamations earned by the team during the season were officially presented to the school. And the uniform worn by All-Ohio Bonnie Beachy was retired.

Head Coach Dick Prest and assistant coach Bill Minchin introduced players and made the presentations.

Members of the team and their families along with several members of the Struthers girls' state championship teams of 1925 and 1926 were honored at a luncheon in the school cafeteria.

I am proud of the Struthers Wildcats' accomplishment, and I am hopeful that their status as State champions will be maintained for many years to come. But just as important as the championship itself is the manner in which it was won. The Wildcats have established a reputation for their good sportsmanship that was recently commended in the Struthers Journal. The Wildcats are true champions in this respect as well.

In addition to Beachy, Fitzpatrick, and Hanna, team members include Cheryl Simko, Lisa Laughner, Colleen Karnes, Paula Ringos, Diane Shirilla, Virginia D'Aitorio, Jamira Ellis, Jackie Beachy, and Cathy Miller. The assistant coach is Bill Minchin.

Mr. Speaker, the Wildcats' victory will serve to increase awareness of women in sports throughout the Mahoning Valley

and the entire State of Ohio. The acclaim surrounding the Wildcats' victory indicates that women are quickly taking their rightful place alongside of their male counterparts in the sports world. Hopefully, Bonnie Beachy, Patty Fitzpatrick, and the other stellar team members will be given opportunities to continue playing basketball in college to further develop their excellent skills and sportsmanship.

I join the residents of Struthers, Ohio, in congratulating each and every one of these women for their accomplishments and wishing them continued success in their sports career.●

HATCH ACT REVISION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been and continue to be opposed to repeal of the Hatch Act and I believe the House acted in folly and haste when it passed H.R. 10 last summer. I am more than pleased to see that my view is supported by one of the Nation's leading newspapers. The Washington Star, in an April 12 editorial, points out that President Carter's proposed reform of the Civil Service system strengthens arguments against repeal of this law. The editorial, which I commend to my colleagues, follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 12, 1978]

HATCH ACT REVISION

President Carter's proposed reform of the Civil Service system already has produced one salutary development: it has strengthened arguments against repeal of the Hatch Act's ban on political activity by federal workers.

Opponents of Hatch Act revision have argued, and rightly so, that it could lead to politicization of the federal service. The danger would be compounded if it and the Civil Service reorganization proposed by Mr. Carter both were enacted.

The Hatch Act revision bill, which has passed the House and is before a committee in the Senate, would allow federal workers to run for office, work in political campaigns, raise funds for candidates and perform other political chores. Polls have indicated that a majority of federal workers want to keep the Hatch Act intact; rather than regarding it as an unwarranted restriction on their activities, they see it as a protection against political coercion.

President Carter's proposed overhaul of the Civil Service system is aimed at making it easier to fire incompetent federal employees and at making advancement in the federal service depend more on merit than time on the job. While there is much to commend Mr. Carter's approach, it would tend to make for less personal security in the federal service, especially at the top levels where the president would create an elite corps of managers called the Senior Executive Service.

If removal of the Hatch Act ban on political activity were combined with the loosening of job protection proposed under the Carter plan, it might well make the federal service as Sen. Charles Mathias, R-Md., warned the other day, "the most partisan it's been since U.S. Grant." The existing Civil Service system, which removes most federal jobs from direct political influence, is an

outgrowth of the "spoils system" abuses of the Grant and other administrations of the 19th Century.

During a hearing before the Senate Government Affairs Committee, Sen. Charles Percy, R-Ill., also expressed reservations about "moving the two [measures] together."

We hope the committee chairman, Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn., was right when he told opponents that they didn't have to worry about the Hatch Act revision because it "isn't going anywhere." But we're not all that confident that supporters of the Hatch Act revision bill, principally the unions and the White House, won't find a way to maneuver the bill to the Senate floor around Senator Ribicoff's opposition.

As Senator Percy pointed out, President Carter could give his Civil Service reorganization plan a boost by pulling back on Hatch Act revision. We suspect that Mr. Carter is more interested in Civil Service reorganization than in Hatch Act revision. If so, we hope he got what seemed to be the clear message that reorganization and Hatch Act revision won't fly together.●

A LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, as always, the first principle of our Nation's foreign policy ought to be that it be determined by what are our Nation's just, best interests. A genuine Middle East settlement to the express benefit of every nation concerned is certainly in our Nation's best interests, as it is to the best interests of peace and liberty everywhere.

The most recent bilateral initiative toward a final settlement begun by Israel and Egypt has certainly had its peaks and valleys. However, having had the opportunity to talk at length with key and participating officials of both sides, I sincerely believe that the quest for a mutually beneficial settlement by both Israel and Egypt is a genuine one.

What is alarming many informed Middle East watchers at the moment is the apparent Midas-touch in reverse demonstrated by the Carter administration in the current Middle East negotiations. It is a Midas-touch in reverse, because everything the administration touches turns to failure. In the space of only 4 months, the White House has succeeded in angering just about everyone with any stake in the current negotiations, whether representing the side of the United Arab Republic or of Israel.

An editorial in the Evening Outlook of Santa Monica, one of California's finer papers, provides an excellent analysis of the current problems Middle East peacemakers are having with the White House. Although dated March 27, the editorial is characteristically prescient. I encourage all of my colleagues to read it, and pass along the good word to any friends any of us might have in the administration.

The editorial follows:

CARTER'S SURRENDER

The following editorial supports Israel's position in the stalled Middle East peace talks.

Our conclusion that Israel is not acting irresponsibly—as is suggested by the Carter administration—is based in part on information assimilated by editor R. D. Funk during a recent 10-day tour of Israel. Funk was in the country when terrorists massacred 35 civilians on the road north of Tel Aviv.

We feel our readers should know, however, that the tour Funk participated in was sponsored by the American Zionist Federation. About 40 American news representatives were on the tour. As a result of the federation sponsorship, the cost to the participants was about half of what it would have been if each individual had paid regular rates for airfare, hotels and meals.

We ask our readers to accept our statement that this reduced cost has not influenced our decision to support Israel in the current dispute. Over the past several years, we have consistently believed Israel must retain defensible borders if she is to survive.

It's becoming increasingly clear that the blame for the breakdown in the Middle East peace talks rests squarely with the Carter Administration—and not with Prime Minister Menachem Begin.

What has happened, we believe, is that President Carter has scrapped the traditional United States interpretation of United Nations Resolution 242 in favor of the Soviet-Arab interpretation. This resolution was adopted by the United Nations in 1967 following Israel's stunning military successes in capturing the Golan Heights from Syria, the West Bank from Jordan and the Sinai Desert from the Egyptians.

It called for "withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." But it also said that Israel was entitled to "secure and recognized boundaries."

Since 1967, the Soviet Union and the Arab states—and more recently, the Palestine Liberation Organization—have claimed that the resolution meant Israel should withdraw "all" her armed forces from "all" her occupied territories. The United States, Israel and other allied nations have argued successfully over the years that omission of the word "all" and "the" from the resolution gives Israel room to negotiate for "secure and recognized boundaries."

In other words, the resolution, which the U.S. helped write, didn't attempt to force Israel to return to her traditional (and implacable) enemies those areas from which they had shelled Israeli civilians and launched terrorist raids into Israeli territory.

Now, apparently, President Carter has told Begin that the old ground rules no longer apply—that as a price for continued U.S. military and moral support, Israel must relinquish control over much of the territory she considers to be absolutely vital to her safety.

This constitutes a major change in U.S. policy in the Mideast. We think it means that the Carter administration has lost control of events and is desperately trying to appease the Arabs and head off another oil price increase.

Saudi Arabia already has warned the United States that there soon may be a new oil price increase because of the declining value of the American dollar. The long slide in the dollar value has been due in large part, of course, to the unchecked flow of American dollars into foreign banks—principally into accounts of the oil-rich Arab states. This outflow of dollars for energy to keep our economy going is the direct result of the Carter administration's inability to deal with the energy crises in this country—to formulate a plan that will permit us to develop our own fossil fuel resources, to move ahead

with nuclear power, to bring on line more solar power, and to conserve our present resources.

As long as we have no strong domestic energy policy—a policy that will relieve us of dependency on foreign oil imports—the Arab nations can call the tune on events in the Middle East. And we think that is precisely why the Middle East peace talks are stalemated, and why they may collapse.

We can be sure that Egyptian President Anwar Sadat didn't initiate peace talks with Israel ever dreaming that Israel would give up the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Israeli settlements in the Sinai Desert. He came to the Knesset saying, in effect, let's trade: The Palestinians need more autonomy, you need your security; both of us need peace. There's a middle ground somewhere.

Now, however, the Carter administration is telling Israel that this isn't a give-and-take matter—that the Israeli government will have to do all the giving.

Palestine Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat must be rubbing his bloodied hands together with glee.

Instead of helping the cause of peace in the Middle East, the president has seriously endangered it.

We think the Carter policy vis-a-vis Israel constitutes a surrender of the vital interests of both countries. We hope Mr. Carter recognizes this before it is too late.●

ILLCIT DRUG IN SCHOOLS

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues may remember, during the last Congress I sponsored legislation to combat one of the most serious problems facing our country and our schools—the increasing use of illicit drugs by our young people. In some schools the problem is reaching critical proportions, and I am again introducing this important measure in hopes that it will be acted upon quickly.

The very worst habit anybody can ever acquire is the use of drugs as a means of escaping from reality. Drugs all too often doom the lives of those young people who use them and rob the families of the drug users of their happiness and, in a large measure, of their hopes and dreams for their children.

Drug use which was once confined to the "street culture" has already become a feature of college life in our country and is increasing in our high schools. Now, even our elementary schools are being invaded by illicit drugs. Few schools are immune to the problem.

A part of this problem, and ample evidence exists to show it, is that many drugs are sold by nonstudents or other individuals who come onto school grounds or hang around school neighborhoods to supply their student customers. This is a cause of concern among law enforcement officers, school administrators, teachers, and parents. I share their concern.

I think we have to come to the realization that people who sell drugs to our young people are criminals and should be treated accordingly. I personally be-

lieve that the selfish individuals who traffic drugs should be given the harshest punishment the law knows.

Our main legal tool against the drug problem, the Controlled Substances Act of 1970, already provides penalties for persons who illegally distribute or dispense controlled substances. Furthermore, the act goes on to double these penalties for individuals selling drugs to persons under 21 years of age. This of course begins to deal with the problem of drugs in our schools.

The legislation I am introducing again today should carry this effort further. This bill would supplement the provisions of the Controlled Substances Act to identify specifically the problem of drugs being sold on or adjacent to school property and provide mandatory sentences for individuals convicted of this offense. I hope this will be a strong tool which will go directly to the problem of drug pushers in our schools.

More specifically, this bill says that a person, 18 years of age or older, who violates the Controlled Substances Act by manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing a controlled substance on or within 100 feet of the grounds of a public or private elementary or secondary school will receive certain additional penalties. Differing from the Controlled Substances Act, this bill prescribes a minimum as well as a maximum sentence. Further additional penalties are prescribed for second or subsequent convictions of the same offense. The bill also provides that these sentences may not be suspended and that probation may not be granted. Persons sentenced under this proposed law would not be eligible for parole until serving at least the minimum sentence prescribed by the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to deal with those persons who have no business in or around our schools except to sell drugs to students. I realize that the bill does not extend to the problem of drug traffic among the students themselves. And I understand that this too is a real and serious problem, but these matters are generally handled by school officials in cooperation with local law enforcement agencies. In addition, a harsh attitude toward outside drug pushers would not only be a warning to the student pusher, it would also go a long way toward drying up these students sources of illicit drugs.

I feel that an important part of this bill is that provision for mandatory sentences for violators. This harsh step is necessary because all too often the courts have failed to provide the necessary sentences for drug pushers. A questionnaire I recently distributed to my constituents showed that 53 percent of the respondents feel lenient courts are the principle cause of rising crime. And 96 percent of them feel that mandatory sentences for serious crimes, including drug violations, are a necessary step to deal with the crime problem. I believe the citizens of this country are calling for action.

I have consulted with law enforcement officers, educators, and parents in my district and State about the drug problem and possible solutions. I believe these concerned and involved people are in

support of the bill I am introducing today. In fact, the attorney general of North Carolina has informed me that he would welcome such legislation as an aid to local and State efforts to deal with the problem of drugs in our schools.

I am certainly not interested in involving the Federal Government any more than it already is in the affairs of our schools, nor do I want to interfere with the work of our State and local law enforcement bodies, which, after all, are the front line in the war on crime of all sorts. This bill is not an intrusion into our schools or local law enforcement, but it is another tool, to be used where appropriate, to assist with the problem of drugs.●

"PERSPECTIVES ON PROTECTIONISM," MONNETT CRYSTALLIZES THE VIEW

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce recently announced the United States sustained a massive trade deficit of \$4.5 billion in February—the 21st consecutive month our trade balance has been in the red.

Shocking? Yes. Surprising? No. It is merely the latest statistic to reflect the steady decline of the United States in world trade. A decade ago, the United States was the champion in that arena. Today it is just another struggling gladiator.

I submit one reason for this development is the traditional position of die-hard "free traders" and "protectionists" who have become an anachronism, refusing to recognize the international trade world of today is not what it was 100, 50, or 10 years ago.

Both concepts are out of step with time. A. A. Monnett, Jr., vice president of corporate planning for U.S. Steel Corp., demonstrated this in a recent speech before a seminar on the "Financial Strategies for Multinational Corporations" in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Monnett contends the terms "free trader" and "protectionist" are artificial and emotional, having no place in a thoughtful analysis of the trade problems confronting the Nation today. Both positions are extreme and fail to include a key factor which, he believes, must be considered in formulating national trade policy.

Mr. Monnett recalls that while trade and/or tariff barriers were being lowered over the world and the economies of Western Europe and Japan were growing in sophistication and capability "a divergent political trend passed virtually unnoticed."

This trend consisted, Mr. Monnett observed, of the United States remaining committed to the market system for its economy, while its major free world partners increasingly brought government into direct or indirect management of industrial affairs. He used Japan and its steel industry to illustrate his point.

Steel, Mr. Monnett explained, is a world commodity with no secrets as to production. Raw materials, equipment, technology are available to any nation. But, steel is the critical industrial material for any manufacturing economy, he emphasized, and every nation must be concerned about its supply to support its industrial economy and to sustain its growth.

Japan early recognized the essentiality of steel and the economic policymakers selected it as a "target" industry. It was to be developed as rapidly as possible, along with some basic consuming industries, such as shipbuilding and automobiles, to capture a large share of the world markets.

The objective was to build an industrial base to utilize available manpower, help domestic industrial growth and through export earnings accumulate foreign exchange to purchase raw materials and other imports.

It takes money to build an industry so the Japanese Government backed commercial bank loans to the industry on a degree impossible for American producers to match in the private market. Because of the Government's support, Japan's steel production rose from 5 million tons in 1950 to 131 million tons in 1973. Last year it produced 113 million tons; yet its own economy could consume just 72 million tons.

To solve the problem of capacity far outstripping domestic demand, the Government turned to exporting its excess steel. In fact, Mr. Monnett notes, exports accounted for nearly two-thirds of steel growth in Japan during the last decade.

The fixed interest on debt, combined with a social policy of lifelong employment meant the Japanese steel industry had to have an extremely high break-even point. Production had to be maintained at a high level even if it meant selling steel at any price. Japan's steel-makers, Mr. Monnett points out, cannot show a profit unless they operate at full capacity. In exporting its steel, Japan, of necessity, also was exporting unemployment in the industry.

Mr. Monnett emphasizes it must be remembered, Japan's steel industry from the start was, and remains today, a creature of government. The country had no particular comparative advantage to be a major steel producer. It has no domestic iron ore, coal, oil, or gas, and technology was purchased. The industry would have had little capital if it were not for Government intervention.

Mr. Monnett asked:

Where is the natural and permanent comparative advantage (upon which the concept of free trade is based) that free traders would have us believe justifies accepting unlimited and uncontrolled amounts of Japanese steel into our markets?

The government's management of the steel industry in Japan so grossly distorted conditions of competition with the United States that the traditional basis for formulating trade policy can no longer be applied, the U.S. steel official believes.

As a matter of fact, he states, competition with a government-managed steel industry abroad has forced the American steel industry to turn to its Government,

which has intervened in the industry's affairs. In essence then, he says, the U.S. market system is eroded as a direct consequence of the political and economic policies of foreign nations. And, Mr. Monnett warns, one wave of Government intervention in industry leads to other waves in other industries.

The United States, he insists, must recognize the change in the world's economic system and strengthen and enforce its laws on injurious and predatory import practices and revise provisions of GATT to provide adequate and effective safeguards against domestic market disruptions.

Mr. Monnett observes we can neither be protectionists or supporters of the old theory of free trade in viewing the world economy of today.

... This issue ... is now at the heart of the most crucial issue of all, the ability of America and its market system to co-exist, prosperously, with the new and different economic systems of friendly sovereign nations throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Monnett admits he has no solution to the problem but he has crystalized the futility of the outmoded debate of "free trade" versus "protectionism." He has given all of us food for thought.●

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON HUMPHREY-HAWKINS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1978, my colleagues made crystal clear the determination of this Congress to attain full employment and reasonable price stability by overwhelmingly voting for passage of H.R. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978. The vote, 257-152, shows a national consensus for enactment of the policies and programs set forth by the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, and serves as an encouragement for early Senate action.

Many efforts have been made to either confuse or minimize the significance of the gains made during floor consideration of the measure, and in order to set the record straight, I urge my colleagues to read the following informed account of the floor activities on H.R. 50, a brief analysis of the provisions of the bill and related grassroots support activities.

The insertion follows:

HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL PASSES HOUSE SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Thursday, March 16, 1978 marked an important day in the history of efforts to achieve a full employment economy in the United States. On that day, proving all the pundits wrong, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act overwhelmingly by a vote of 257-152. During four days of debate, the Full Employment Bill supporters were successful, in a series of record and non-record votes, in turning back amendments designed to weaken the legislation.

As the focus of attention moves to the

Senate, it is important to assess the progress which has been made, particularly in light of continuing attempts to minimize the significance of the gains.

The House of Representatives began debate on March 8th on the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, described by Business Week magazine as one which "puts the nation's unemployment problem squarely at the center of economic policymaking for years to come," a bill which the chief New York Times economic correspondent described as "establish(ing) targets for economic activity and jobs involving a degree of specificity the nation has never known before."

That was the bill which was presented to the House of Representatives for action, and that was the bill which, with some refinements, was passed by the overwhelming margin. Opponents of the Full Employment Act, seeing the extent of support which the bill had received across the nation as people became more familiar with its provisions, decided not to make a head-on attack on H.R. 50, but instead to subvert the bill's purpose of achieving full employment with price stability by trying to write in other economic policies which could be used as distractions from the primary full employment goal.

H.R. 50 ANTI-INFLATION PROVISIONS

This was a clever strategy, but, unfortunately for its proponents, one which the House saw through, and one which the public will see through as well. The strategy was to introduce amendments labeled as "anti-inflation" amendments, a "permanent" tax cut amendment, and anti-government regulations amendments. The strategy of those offering these amendments was that anyone who voted against them could be called "for inflation", "against a balanced budget", "against tax cuts" and "for government regulation".

The distinction is crucial. Take, for instance, the question of inflation. The Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act contains the strongest program for price stability yet put forth during the current debate. But price stability is to be achieved at the same time as unemployment is lowered, rather than, as was done by the past two Administrations, maintaining high unemployment in the belief that it would keep inflation low.

Thus, When Congressman Ronald Sarasin (R-Conn.) offered an amendment to set a specific target for inflation in the Full Employment Act, he was offering a provision which could be used by economic policymakers in the future as an excuse for not implementing full employment policies. Instead Congressman James Wright (D-Tex.), the Majority Leader of the House, offered an anti-inflation amendment which made clear that price stability is to be achieved through policies which begin by focusing on achieving full employment. Wright's amendment was approved by the House by a vote of 277-143.

A BALANCED BUDGET AND BALANCED GROWTH

Similarly, an amendment designed to make a balanced budget a primary goal of national policy, introduced by Congressman John Ashbrook (R-Ohio), was soundly defeated in favor of an amendment by Congressman Butler Derrick (D-S.C.) and Congressman Max Baucus (D-Mont.), which made clear that a balanced budget was to be achieved through full employment policies. As more people work, more pay taxes, the government spends less on unemployment and other social insurance programs, and we move the nation toward a balanced Federal budget.

After the House had firmly rejected the effort to confuse the purpose of the Full Employment Act, and had instead adopted merely clarifying amendments, Congressman Charles Wiggins (R-Calif.) offered a motion to strike the entire bill, thereby killing it for the Session. He argued that the bill had been weighted down with amendments and

was like a Christmas tree and should therefore be killed. The House's resounding response to that contention was "no" by a vote of 106 to 310. Yet at least one commentator has tried to make the Wiggins effort into a major condemnation of the bill.

Those who remember the days, several years back, when the "experts" laughed when we said that Congress was going to pass a Full Employment bill, can now smile at the victory won in the House. Yet we must be clear-eyed that we still face a hurdle in getting the bill passed by the Senate, and we must always recognize that the Full Employment bill is the first step in pursuing full employment policies. The Administration must develop and implement the specific economic policies which will achieve full employment. It must look at every economic decision, every program, and tell us how each policy and program will move the nation toward full employment. With the resounding victory of the 257-152 vote in the House current, the Administration should begin the specific full employment policies.

Persons around the country must begin a campaign of support for the passage of the Full Employment bill by the Senate. Prospects are good for passage, and public support of the bill, and particularly opposition to weakening amendments, is necessary for final enactment. Full Senate action is expected in June.

WHAT THE RECENTLY PASSED HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL DOES

1. Recommends the Federal Government to the goal of creating conditions that assure meaningful employment to all who are able, willing, and seeking employment opportunities. The bill mandates interim goals towards this end, and provides for the availability of better jobs, training programs, opportunities for promotion and better job security.

2. Provides for the comprehensive integration of our fiscal and monetary policies and programs with structural programs to assist disadvantaged groups and reduce inflation.

3. Requires the President to set forth annual anti-inflation goals and to detail the policies and programs needed to reach reasonable price stability and full employment. The bill rejects the discredited "trade off" theory, which encouraged slowing down the economy to help promote price stability.

4. Provides for a coordinated and democratic economic policy decision-making process for the Federal Government. Requires annual and long-term projections to be made by the President and the Federal Reserve Board, and to be reviewed by the Congress. We would no longer have to react to one crisis situation after another (such as energy, food, recessions, etc.).

5. Specifies an interim numerical target for the reduction of unemployment to 4 percent overall within 5 years. This replaces the unacceptable notion that 6 percent unemployment, or higher, is "tolerable unemployment."

6. Establishes the Federal Government as the employer of last resort. It is possible that the last resort jobs may not be needed at all or only in limited amounts if the right policies and programs are undertaken.

7. Provides for the bedrock commitment of reducing the high unemployment levels of certain groups in the labor force (youth, minorities, women, elderly, veterans, and the handicapped) to the national average on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis.

A full employment society provides: Better jobs, security and working conditions for the employed; meaningful jobs for the unemployed; markets for businessmen and farmers; lower taxes as a result of less welfare and more revenues from productive activities; more goods and services as reasonable prices for consumers; and less crime, social disease, and civil disorders.

A LOOK AT THE VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE

H.R. 50 was passed by the House of Representatives on March 16, 1978, by a vote of 257 to 152.

The vote showed a national consensus for the enactment of the full employment bill, with votes from 42 states, including every state in the deep South and 24 Republicans, joining 233 Democrats from all over the country, in a resounding majority decision.

FULL EMPLOYMENT NATIONAL SUPPORT GROUPS

AFL-CIO.
Economy Policy Committee, AFL-CIO.
Industrial Union Dpt., AFL-CIO.
Building and Construction Union Dpt., AFL-CIO.

United Auto Workers.
National Farmers Union.
United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Urban League.
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.
A. Phillip Randolph Institute.
Congressional Black Caucus.
Mexican American Political Assoc.
G.I. Forum.
National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens.

National Council of Churches.
U.S. Catholic Conference.
United Presbyterian Church.
American Jewish Committee.
National Council of Negro Women.
Coalition of Labor Union Women.
Full Employment Action Council.
National Conference on Public Service Employment.

National Women's Political Caucus.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
National Association of Counties.
National Education Association.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

Americans for Democratic Action.
American Federation of Teachers.

COMMENTS ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Hobart Rowen—Chief economic writer for the Washington Post; "There is much more than meets the eye in the compromise Humphrey-Hawkins 'full employment' bill . . . the vigor of the attack on this latest Humphrey-Hawkins version should suggest to the careful observer that the proposal would, in fact, have an impact on the economy and the way economic policy is made . . . Complying with the timetables would not be optional . . . The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, as it emerges now, with Carter's cooperation, is worthwhile."

Charles C. Killingsworth—University Professor, Economics and Labor, Michigan State Univ.; "... the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Bill represents the straight line between two points. I believe that the approach set forth in this bill would activate a multiplicity of efforts in government and in the private sector which would give us a fairer society, a more compassionate society, a sounder society, and even a more prosperous society."

Bishop James Rausch—General Secretary U.S. Catholic Conference; "What happens to a nation that begins to accept the notion that it cannot use the talents and labor of all its people? What happens to us as a people as we watch families which have made the slow and painful climb up the economic ladder, only to be pushed down again into poverty by the loss of a job?"

The National Council of Churches in the U.S.A.—"We commit ourselves to the task of shaping a national policy of full employment which would provide the hopes for a better and more productive life for ourselves, our families and our neighbors. We call upon the Federal Government to make full employment the nation's number one priority."

Clayton Fritchey—Editorialist/Journalist; "The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, as introduced was based on the sound proposition that no matter how costly it is to put people to work, it is far more costly and wasteful to pay them not to work, as we do now with unemployment compensation and other benefits that run into many billions of dollars."

Carl Rowan—Editorialist/Journalist; "It does something very important: It establishes the right of all Americans to a useful job at fair wages. We have never before had such a specific national commitment . . . You ought to understand what I am sure Jimmy Carter understands: While the compromise gives the President some flexibility, he cannot change the 4 percent goal without Congressional agreement . . . I hope the Congress passes [the Humphrey-Hawkins bill]."

RECOGNITION OF PRESIDENTIAL COURAGE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch recognizes the courage displayed by President Jimmy Carter in taking actions unpopular with some segments of American public opinion, actions clearly in the best interests of the United States as a whole. The American people can benefit from the perceptive analysis contained in Mr. Harsch's article, and I include it in the RECORD:

THE MAKING OF A PRESIDENT

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Just two weeks after President Carter became the first American President since the days of Dwight Eisenhower to say a firm "no" to Israel he startled Washington again by defying the Greek lobby.

No president would challenge either the supporters of Israel or the supporters of Greece if he thought he could avoid doing it. Israel enjoys the support in Washington of probably the strongest and most effective organization ever mobilized there on behalf of a foreign country. The Greek lobby controls nothing like the number of votes in Congress that Israel's friends can muster, but it probably ranks with Italian, Irish, and Polish lobbies in the second rank.

Certainly no president would want to dis-appoint both the Jewish and Greek communities at the same time, particularly if he was also trying to round up the votes necessary to carry his controversial Panama Canal treaties through to ratification in the Senate.

The fact that Mr. Carter did take steps dis-pressing to Israel's friends and bitterly opposed by the Greeks, and within two weeks of time and while the Panama treaties are still in danger, shows how much importance he attaches to the steps he did take. One was to make clear to Israeli Prime Minister Begin his profound disappointment over Mr. Begin's response to the Sadat peace initiative. The other was the decision to ask Congress to lift the three-year embargo on the sale of American weapons to Turkey.

Political expediency would have counseled Mr. Carter to put off any confrontation with either the Israeli or Greek lobby at least until after he had had his final test in the Senate on the Panama treaties.

Obviously, Mr. Carter thinks that the last best chance for peace in the Middle East will

be lost unless Mr. Begin becomes more responsive to Mr. Sadat. And obviously, he thinks it essential to the welfare of the NATO alliance that the delivery of weapons to Turkey be resumed even though Turkey clings to a larger share of the island of Cyprus than most neutral onlookers think is fair or reasonable.

Here then are two cases where Mr. Carter has done what he believes to be in the best long-term interests of the United States regardless of immediate and inevitable short-term disapproval by important and influential blocs of Americans. He is saying "no" to a lot of Americans with real political influence and real future voting power.

No president likes to have to do unpopular things. Mr. Carter did virtually no unpopular thing during his first year in office. He did all sorts of things which were immediately popular with the groups who obtained short-term benefits.

One of his first deeds was to raise White House salaries (extravagantly, in my opinion). That deed is coming home to roost now. It makes it difficult for him to oppose price and wage rises. Then he pleased a bigger chunk of Americans by agreeing to a rise in the minimum wage, and more by raising payroll taxes to support social security. He went along with higher farm price supports, and with import controls.

Every one of these actions was popular with some group of citizens, and every one was inflationary. Mr. Carter's first year was marked by permissiveness. He was the good guy who liked to say yes, and almost never said no. And it was not a year of spectacular success.

No one likes to say no, particularly a president who wants to be reelected. But it is a safe rule that by and large the great presidents are the ones who have done the hard, the difficult, the dangerous things which they would much rather not have done.

We cannot know yet whether Mr. Carter will from now on do many more things which he thinks ought to be done no matter how unpopular with some one or another important segment of the American population. But he has dared to disappoint two powerful constituencies and—so far—no roof has fallen in. And we do know that the inflation rate is dangerously high and that it will go higher unless Mr. Carter embarks upon a consistent anti-inflation program.

Presidents Nixon and Ford underestimated the momentum of inflation. Mr. Carter has obviously done the same. He is now the third president in line who has faced inflation and been unable to manage it. This is his moment at Armageddon. Can he learn to say no, and make it stick? If he does he can still be a successful president. If he does not, he will probably be just another one-term president. We may be watching the turning point in his presidency right now. ●

CONGRATULATORY MESSAGE TO LOCAL 599 HONOREES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend six persons who have distinguished themselves with 20 years each of service as elected union officials from UAW Local 599, which serves the workers of the Buick Motor Division plant in Flint, Mich. Special recognition also is being given three others.

Local 599 is one of the Nation's oldest UAW locals, receiving its charter on

January 10, 1939, only 2 years after the sitdown strikes in Flint that led to the birth of the UAW-CIO. It has a long history of strong local leadership, and annually honors those elected union officials who have 20 or more years of elected service. The honorees receive the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award, which is an appropriate honor to be given in the name of the man who devoted his life to helping others obtain social justice and enjoy a better life.

Members of the United Auto Workers can take pride in the knowledge of belonging to a progressive union that is universally recognized for its social leadership as well as for its dedication to the well-being of its members.

I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues this year's winners of the Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award from UAW Local 599. The honorees for 20 years of elected service as union officials are Danny D. Sain, Stan Marshall, Charles L. Weaver, John Neilson, Robert Dallas, and Lyman Turner. Mr. Sain is president of the Greater Flint CAP Council, former chairman of the Genesee County Democratic Party, former president of the Beecher Board of Education, and the 1975 recipient of the Liberty Bell Award from the Genesee County Bar Association.

A Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award for community involvement also will be presented to Robin B. Owens by recommendation of local 599, and a special local 599 award will be presented to Lloyd and Mary Eckenrod for their involvement in retiree affairs.

All will be presented their awards at local 599's third annual retirees' banquet on Sunday, April 16, 1978, in Flint. ●

SECRET NEGOTIATIONS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the campaign President Carter frequently indicated his belief in open government, or government in the sunshine. Last April when he proposed his national energy plan, and frequently since, he has also indicated his strong support for the rapid development of solar energy. Given that we apparently have a heliophile as President it is difficult to imagine how the natural gas pricing issue has been drawn into the shadows, into secret behind-closed-doors White House negotiations.

If the press reports are true, then yesterday and again today the President and his chief energy adviser are closeted with a select band of Members from the majority party in sessions which will presumably determine the fate of those that use as well as produce natural gas.

There is no need for these negotiations to be conducted in secret. They should

be out in the open. In the words of then candidate Carter:

Meetings of federal boards, commissions, and regulatory agencies must be open to the public, along with those of congressional committees. (The only exception should be those actually involving narrowly defined national security, those dealing with unproven charges similar to grand jury proceedings, and those whose preliminary knowledge might cause serious damage to our nation's economy.)

If these meetings are not open to public scrutiny, then, again in the words of then candidate Carter:

The veils of secrecy have seemed to thicken around Washington.

It was, perhaps, a slip of the tongue when Senator HENRY JACKSON, one of the chief Senate negotiators on the natural gas issue stated:

You can see why I have urged strongly that we have quiet diplomacy . . . I think the public get-togethers before we really have our ducks in a row create nothing but problems . . .

Yet this is the view of open government which the majority party has adopted in this vital area. Energy policy is all pervasive and it is unfortunate that President Carter feels that he must deal with it out of public view. ●

IS THE WHITE HOUSE FINANCING THE NEW LEFT?

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, certainly the prevailing political climate is one in which citizens are demanding that their Government be held more accountable. The public demands more scrutiny by those who would spend taxpayers' dollars, and they are skeptical of how their money is used. I share this skepticism, and I encourage it.

In fact, I would like to see a systematic and comprehensive investigation of Federal spending at all levels, and especially by that part of our Government which is furthest away from the people—the Federal agencies. Unelected and too often unaccountable even to the President appointing them, the agencies need to be checked by the eternal vigilance of Congressmen who were elected to represent taxpayers everywhere. The Government Accounting Office does an excellent job, in my opinion. The GAO keeps close tabs on how much is spent.

But it ought to be the role of Congress to more closely evaluate these agency appropriations. We ought to be investigating not only how much is being spent, but closely determining why it is spent, and concluding whether or not certain line items are wasteful.

Perhaps the ACTION agency is a prime candidate for such heightened congressional scrutiny as I am proposing. If what Pat Buchanan describes in the following column is illustrative of agency activity in the Carter administration, we

are obliged to the taxpayer to begin a systematic review of agency spending now. As always, Mr. Buchanan lucidly cuts through to the core of the problem. Read for yourself, and sincerely ask yourself whether or not this core is rotten; whether or not House appropriations for ACTION are in fact being used to finance the new left.

Regardless of one's own identification for or against new left politics, it is only reasonable to ask that money collected from the taxpayers without their consent not be used for partisan political purposes. If indeed we are financing partisan political action at ACTION, then it is the responsibility of the Congress to take the necessary steps to "clean up its act."

The column follows:

Is ACTION CARTER'S RADICAL AGENCY?

Last year President Carter directed the U.S. delegation to the U.N. to drop its opposition to Hanoi's admission. It was, you might say, a red-letter day for U.S. Communists, fellow travelers, and radicals who had worked diligently for a decade or more for an American defeat in Southeast Asia.

When Hanoi's beaming delegates arrived at Manhattan's Beacon Theater for a welcoming party, the audience of thousands exploded with applause.

Present, and all choked up by the occasion, was Sam Brown, Carter's choice to head ACTION, the umbrella agency that contains the Peace Corps.

"I am deeply moved," Sam said. "It's difficult to describe my feelings—what can you say when the kinds of things that 15 years of your life were wrapped up in are suddenly before you."

Well, it's difficult to describe my feelings about that comment. What can you say about an American who spent 15 years helping bring to power a regime which seeks to extort our economic assistance by holding for ransom the bodies of dead American pilots?

Sam appears a mite more candid these days about the kind of peace he always sought for Southeast Asia. He is more candid about other matters as well.

In an interview in December Penthouse—that journalistic compost heap where radical politics is mixed evenly with softcore pornography Sam volunteered his views * * * colleagues at the FBI and CIA:

"I take second place to no one in my hatred of the intelligence agencies."

His indulgent interrogator wondered if perhaps the wealthy, the business community, and Republicans in general might not feel a bit threatened by what Sam was up to at ACTION.

"I assume they will and they ought to," said Sam. "If they don't then I'm not doing my job."

The budget for Brown's umbrella agency is around \$200 million. And there seems little evidence to refute the charge of Illinois Republican Robert Michel that Brown is engaged in an "effort to transform ACTION into a tax-supported sanctuary for radical activists hired at outrageously high salaries."

Under Brown, ACTION is crawling with veterans of the "movement." Lee _____ one of the Chicago Seven, was brought aboard as a consultant at \$180 a day. As director of VISTA, the domestic peace corps, Sam selected Margery Tabanian.

According to a recent conservative newsletter, Marge junketed to Hanoi at the height of the war, while American POW were down the street at the Hanoi Hilton being tortured in Uncle Ho's prisons.

She came home to declare, at a U.S. war crimes press conference, "It's no longer

bridges, railroads and military targets that are being attacked, but 90-year-old men, and civilians who cannot run fast enough to bomb shelters."

Today, this Axis Sally of the Vietnam War takes home a higher federal salary than almost all the young American pilots she accused of war crimes six years ago.

Under her leadership VISTA has made a \$400,000 donation to the Midwest Academy. Run by ex-SDSer Heather Booth, with the assistance of hubby Paul, the Chicago-based academy, by its own admission, instructs radicals in confrontation tactics over such issues as government funding for abortion, and "redistributing social wealth and power."

Yet in a letter to The New York Times a month ago, Brown asserted his belief that "public funds should not be used to promote a political cause." His record in office belies that statement.

What is needed, and what appears to be coming, is a sweeping congressional investigation of ACTION. The nation has a right to know how under President Jimmy Carter an agency established to help the poor has become a burgeoning rabbit warren of the radical left. ●

THE FARM POPULATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the St. Paul Dispatch raises a fundamental question, "How long can the 'family farm' remain the 'family farm'?"

An increasing number of family farmers have to expand their farms in order to make an adequate return on their investment due to decreasing prices received for commodities tied to increasing costs of production. In Congress, we should look at the underlying reasons for the push to expansion as well as the result—larger farms run by fewer farmers.

The April 11, 1978, editorial is thought provoking and I hope my colleagues have an opportunity to read it.

The article follows:

THE FARM POPULATION

Fewer than 8 million Americans, out of a population of about 206 million, now live on farms, according to the Bureau of the Census.

Considering the annual surpluses produced by American agriculture, these figures could be considered a tribute to the farmer's efficiency—and so they are. We can take immense pride in the fact that with only about 3½ percent of our people engaged in growing crops, raising cattle and milking dairy herds, we vastly out-produce a country such as the Soviet Union, where nearly 50 percent of the people still are "on the land."

But the figures can be cause for concern, too. The decline in farm population in 1977—a decrease of 5.4 percent from the 1976 figures—was of course only a continuation of a long historical trend. Since 1970 alone the farm population has dropped an average of 3.1 percent per year.

Moreover, the figures are misleading, because the Census Bureau defines a farm as anything 10 acres or more producing \$50 or more in agriculture products offered for sale. Considering that the average-sized farm is now 400 acres, it is obvious the actual num-

ber of real farm folks is much smaller than 8 million.

So what? What's to worry—so long as those left on the land are farming as much land as ever and can keep on outproducing everybody else in the world?

Well, how long can the "family farm" keep on expanding? The farmer who used to be able to handle no more than, say, 80 acres with his and his wife's labor and that of a hired hand, and two or three of his sons and daughters, now is, likely as not, farming 500 or 600 acres with only his wife to help. And doing a superb job. But is there not a limit to be reached? Is there not a point beyond which he cannot go even with the very latest and best and most powerful tractors and combines and multi-bottom plows? Isn't there a limit to the number of cows he can milk, no matter how efficient his all-electric operation?

How long can the "family farm" remain the "family farm"? That is the basic, and increasingly disquieting, question. That is a question that goes beyond (though it is related to) questions of parity, of seasonal fluctuations in prices, of the ever-increasing costs of production. Fundamental matters of production and distribution, involving changes that perhaps not even the best agricultural theorists can envision today, may be involved—indeed, will be involved if the farm is to remain a stronghold of individual initiative in the United States. ●

CONGRESSIONAL DECISIONMAKING PROCESS

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of issues throughout the 95th Congress involving major differences of opinion between the administration and members of the legislative branch. Those issues are well known to all of us—the B-1 bomber, the breeder reactor, the Panama Canal treaties, and Middle Eastern arms sales, to name just a few. When such issues arise, Members of Congress are faced with a multitude of pressures they must react to in arriving at their final voting positions. These include the views of their constituents, the views of other parties that may be affected by the legislation, their inclination (or disinclination) to support the President, and of course, the merits of the issue.

All too often this last item gets lost in the haze of conflicting arguments and pressures swirling about an issue. In some cases, due to overemphasis of certain arguments, such as potentially unfavorable reaction by the Executive to our legislative actions, we may fail to exercise our congressional mandates and responsibilities. It is for this reason that I want to call to your attention the remarks by my colleague, Congressman BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Jr., during a Science and Technology Committee markup session yesterday on an amendment concerning the Clinch River breeder reactor.

Mr. GOLDWATER's thoughtful commentary goes right to the heart of the decisionmaking process that each of us,

as Members of Congress, must participate in on a daily basis. I commend these remarks to my colleagues, and congratulate Mr. GOLDWATER on his insight and, incidentally, on his contributions to a winning argument.

His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR. ON THE AMENDMENT REGARDING THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed by the gentleman's amendment, which apparently involves the termination of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Project. The most striking feature of this amendment, in my opinion, is that it completely ignores the testimony that was presented to this Committee by the electric utility industry, reactor manufacturers and other participants in the nuclear program. What struck me most about that testimony is that the utility industry, which is responsible for keeping the lights burning in his country, came in here and told us that "the nuclear breeder reactor program is the backbone for our long-range capacity of providing a reliable source of electricity for the future generations of our society," and yet the amendment would destroy the keystone of that program.

We have also heard from the environmentalists, who are opposed to this amendment. Thus, we have a situation where both the nuclear advocates and critics are opposed to the approach now before us. Since it won't satisfy either of them, I don't see how we can proceed with it. We are, after all, meant to be a representative body, yet the decisions this amendment would make are not at all representative of the views they have expressed to us.

As to the views that were expressed by some of my colleagues here this morning, to the effect that they are for the breeder program but could not support Clinch River, I ask how we can ever expect to benefit from these energy technologies if we do not have the courage to build the plants that will show whether they are really practical? What is more, when I hear my colleagues say that we have to back off Clinch River because the President will veto it anyway, I ask if we are not abdicating our congressional responsibilities by this kind of approach. We have two independent branches of government in disagreement here, but if one, the Congress, refuses to exercise its duties due to fear that another, the Executive, will disapprove, then I say that we are ignoring our constitutional mandate to make ourselves heard.

Finally, perhaps the most striking feature of the Administration proposal to terminate Clinch River and establish a conceptual design study for a new, large breeder is that it seems to hold together on the surface, but analysis indicates that it has been thought out only to a point, beyond which it starts to unravel. This became apparent to me when I read the answers to the questions that I and other Members of this Committee submitted to the Department of Energy.

I don't know how many of my colleagues on the Committee have also taken the time to read these answers through, but I believe they contain several points which must be noted before we can act on the Administration proposal. They show, for example, that:

1. There is uncertainty within DOE as to exactly what the proposal would accomplish.

2. We may lose the utility industry as participants in future cooperatively-funded energy demonstration projects.

3. The Federal Government would be left with open-ended, unknown liabilities from the cancellation of Clinch River.

4. The number of people whose jobs would be lost would be at least twice that which we were told in testimony by the Administration.

5. Valuable licensing experience will be lost.

6. Unnecessary time will be lost in establishing the next breeder project, if it is ever established.

7. At least a ten-year delay will occur between the availability of the new breeder, if built, and the date when Clinch River was originally to be available.

8. Dangerous reliance will be placed on foreign technology, a situation which all previous Administration's and Congresses have rejected.

9. We are being given a snow job as to the "existence" of additional uranium supplies that might justify a delay in the breeder. There are no additional uranium supplies, at least not yet.

10. There are no firm criteria as to when the large breeder may be built, if at all.

It would seem to me as a matter of common sense, especially for all my colleagues who are "for" the breeder, that we should stop playing politics and vote this issue on its merits. And those merits, as the answers to my questions have shown, are clear—we still need Clinch River, and we will be greatly damaging the Nation's energy prospects if we meekly sit back and vote for its termination. ●

METAL INNOVATIONS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, new ideas are the stuff of which American industry is supposed to be made.

Therefore, I insert the following for the RECORD.

The article follows:

METAL INNOVATIONS CHIEF HIGH ON HIS NEW IRON POWDER PROCESS

(By Jim O'Connor)

STAMFORD, CONN.—M. D. (Doc) Ayers, president of Metal Innovations, Inc., here, is a man with an idea whose time he hopes has at long last arrived.

So far this year, he reports about a dozen companies have paid him a total of \$60,000 to demonstrate his idea for production of iron powders and a variety of alloys through use of a water atomization process.

The resulting powders, as he has repeatedly shown, can be fed directly into a compacting mill, then into a sintering furnace and finally through a hot roll mill from which they emerge as strip ready for the fabricator.

"There is a worldwide need for strip and we could set up a 50,000 ton a year mill for \$5-million . . . but no one wants to be first," he said during an interview last week.

"We can produce steel in gages ranging from 0.025 to 0.050 for about \$100 a ton that would cost \$200 a ton in the cold roll process," Ayers insists.

Moreover, he claims the finished strip will represent a 95 percent yield of the raw material, compared with about a 70 percent yield for a standard cold roll and anneal production.

The Ayers method can also be used to produce tool steel strip or billet from powder for conversion to rod with 50 percent better performance than conventional production methods, the inventor and holder of six patents declares.

In the Metal Innovations process, molten metal is poured from an electric furnace directly into a stream of water, the pressure and flow of which is carefully controlled.

Result is almost instantaneous atomization of the metal into a powder requiring no

secondary annealing operation except drying before going to the compacting mill or, in the case of preforms, to the compacting press.

Among corporations Ayers says have looked at his process are General Motors, which was interested in stainless steel containers for the new catalytic converters and Westinghouse which was once interested in 42 percent nickel alloy for a controlled expansion alloy that could be sealed to glass.

Delay in the adoption of catalytic converters caused GM to postpone further stainless steel work and Westinghouse subsequently went out of the alloy business.

Last year, Ayers and his two-man staff produced 5,000 pounds of nickel powder for Sherritt Gordon at a rate of 1,000 pounds a day, but he is uncertain about that company's plans.

Because his equipment here is suited only to pilot size runs from 100 to 300 pound melts, demonstration strip is usually limited to 10 to 12 foot lengths and 3 to 6-inch widths.

However, conversion of melt to powder is so rapid that in a commercial model, Ayers is convinced that continuous strip production would be practical.

Sample strip produced has included low carbon, carbon, tool steel and silicon, nickel and copper alloys.

Ayers held supervisory jobs with U.S. Steel, Stelco, Wheeling Steel and with Kennecott Copper Corporation, where he was assistant to the president and later director of engineering before leaving in 1963 to pursue his powder process.

Since then, he has exhausted most of his personal funds and has raised some capital through sale of stock to members of his family to keep the pilot plant going.

"Our number one problem is to get the first powder plant and strip plant going commercially," he said. "We have the processes and plans to scale up to commercial production and can build it, but we don't have the money to do it."

"Our process involves low capital cost, low operating costs and eliminates eight or nine operations in standard steel production. Our second problem is to get some interested company to be first," Ayers said.

MAYBE GREATEST YEAR EVER AT OVER 150 MILLION TONS TO WIN BACK NO. 1 SPOT

(By Hi Howard)

PITTSBURGH.—The American steel industry has just about chalked up its greatest year in history.

By yearend, barring a most unlikely catastrophe, its production of raw steel will have reached an unprecedented 150-million tons-plus and its shipments of finished steel products will have hit an all-time high of at least 108-million tons and perhaps as much as 110-million tons.

In physical achievement—in the smelting of iron ore, in the coking of coal, in the rolling, processing and finishing of steel into myriad forms—many new records will almost certainly be established.

During 1972, for the first time in more than half a century, the United States lost world leadership in steelmaking to another nation. The Soviet Union actually poured more raw steel.

But this year American steelmakers will almost certainly win back the No. 1 position.

Almost every domestic mill is crammed with orders, and most are rigidly controlling their acceptance of additional orders, even from old customers.

In a market that appears stronger and broader than ever before, indications are that the producers of every kind of steel—stainless and alloy, as well as carbon grades—will be able to sell all they can make not only through the remainder of 1973, but deep into 1974.

It is obvious, currently, that the American steel industry doesn't have sufficient capacity to make all the finished steel that American consumers need and want.

The actual consumption of finished steel in the U.S. is expected to reach around 120-million tons by year-end.

But total domestic mill shipments including about 4-million tons into the export trade (mostly fulfilling long-term commitments) probably won't exceed 110-million tons even though the nation's steelmakers continue to run at full capacity.

To make up for most of the shortfall between actual consumption and domestic supply, steel imports this year will total from 14-million to 15-million tons, and may be even higher.

In general, the price tags on this imported metal have been as high or higher than those on domestic mill products. So it's generally agreed that the domestic mills could have sold considerably more if they had had it to sell.

Which raises a big question:

Why doesn't the American steel industry have enough capacity to meet at least domestic needs?

As part of the answer, as has already been brought out, U.S. steelmen point to their industry's poor profitability over recent years.

UPSURGE IN IMPORTS

But they also put much of the blame for the earnings lag on the tremendous upsurge in steel imports between the years 1965 and (expectedly) 1973—an upsurge which continued despite such feeble restraining moves as the so-called "voluntary quota arrangements."

Both parts of this answer, they explain, are intertwined. Since the imported steel was being offered at prices well below domestic mill prices, competition held down all steel prices and the domestic steel industry couldn't earn enough to spend enough.

At the same time, since foreign mills had captured such a large share of the American market, most American steelmakers couldn't boost their sales volume sufficiently to financially justify adding more capacity.

During the years from 1965 through 1972, the records show that steel consumption in the U.S. (as measured by the total purchases of steel) rose 6.4-million tons annually, while imports gained 7.6-million tons annually and domestic mill shipments to domestic consumers fell off 1.2-million tons a year.

In short, imports not only took all of the growth in total steel demand, but also cut into domestic mill sales.

IMPORTS REDUCING

During 1971, steel imports captured 18.4 percent of the total U.S. market for finished steel. During 1972, partly because of the dollar's devaluation, imports eased a bit but still gobbled up 17.2 percent of the whole market.

This year, with steel demand at a new peak not only in the United States but around the world, steel imports will be down again, probably to about 15-million tons, or about 12.5 percent.

But the import decline this year doesn't reflect any real improvement in the domestic industry's ability to compete against foreign mills.

Rather, it will mainly reflect the super-strong demand for steel in Europe, in South America and in the Orient, and the fact that world prices for steel have bounded up to levels as high or higher than in the U.S.

The foreign mills are simply selling more of their steel in their home markets. The Japanese mills, in particular, have a bigger home market, and also have found new and sometimes more attractive markets in other countries since the dollar's second devaluation and the imposition of price ceilings on American-made steel.

Practically gone from the marketplace are the "bargain" prices on steel formerly quoted by importers. And left in the lurch are a number of domestic steel users who were big customers of foreign-made steel while it was readily available at low prices.

Many of these have, of course, tried to turn back to domestic suppliers, but—understandably—aren't getting much sympathy or help.

What's obvious, of course, is that the foreign mill retreat from the American steel market has thrown the full burden of meeting this year's much-greater-than-expected upsurge in steel demand upon the domestic mills.

What consumers want to know is what can and should be done to make enough steel dependably available in the domestic market as soon as possible. ●

VERMONT LEGISLATURE SUPPORTS FEDERAL FUNDING FOR BARRIER REMOVAL FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont regarding the Federal funding of special education. The Vermont State Legislature specifically endorses two bills on this issue: H.R. 7626 and H.R. 9761.

I introduced H.R. 7626 on September 7, 1977, as an attempt to focus congressional attention on the extremely unfair situation created by the wide-reaching section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination against the handicapped. This law was passed 5 years ago, and there has not been a penny of Federal money appropriated to help the States comply with the HEW regulations. A conservative estimate from an unofficial study done by HEW is that it would take \$2.4 billion to correct current violations of this law. Others estimate the amount to be considerably higher; probably as high as \$50 to \$100 billion. Although my constituents know that I do not normally advocate this type of Government spending, H.R. 7626 would authorize \$6 billion for the implementation of section 504. Otherwise, the burden will continue to fall, as it does now, at the State and local level, and will strain already tight resources. The Education and Labor Committee has begun to hold hearings on the reauthorization of this act, and I expect that this funding problem will be addressed, and hopefully alleviated in the near future.

The people in the State of Vermont recognize the need to do something for handicapped citizens. I think the State is addressing its responsibilities and is perceptively moving in the right direction. The resolution by the general assembly reflects a recognition of the problems they face. I can assure them, as well as my colleagues, that I will continue to work very hard to attempt to solve these problems.

The text of the resolution follows:

R-70. JOINT SENATE RESOLUTION RELATING TO FEDERAL FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION J.R.S. 40

Whereas, the federal government, through the enactment of P.L. 94-142, the Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, has required that the state guarantee a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children in Vermont by September, 1978; and

Whereas, despite the requirement in P.L. 94-142 that the state guarantee free appropriate special education services this year, the federal government proposes to phase in its financial commitment to support these services through 1982; and

Whereas, federal grants to provide special education services to handicapped children under P.L. 94-142 will only, at best, provide a fraction of the funds required of the states beginning at 5 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States in 1978, and increasing to 10 percent in 1979, 20 percent in 1980, 30 percent in 1981 and reaching 40 percent in 1982; and

Whereas, the federal government, through P.L. 94-142, is attempting to achieve maximum control over state special education policies and procedures with a minimum of federal financial support; and

Whereas, the federal government, through section 504 of P.L. 93-112, the Rehabilitation of the Handicapped Act of 1973, has provided as a matter of civil right a federal action against discrimination on the basis of handicapping condition; and

Whereas, through the enactment of this "section 504" the federal government has exposed the state to potentially expensive civil liability, particularly with respect to architectural barriers to the handicapped in public buildings, yet has provided no federal financial contribution to meet this liability, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That the General Assembly of the state of Vermont endorses the laudatory purposes of P.L. 94-142 and "section 504" of P.L. 93-112 to provide a free appropriate public education to handicapped children and to remove any remaining discrimination against them, and be it further

Resolved: That the federal government must recognize its responsibility to provide an equitable share of the resources required to meet these commitments it has imposed, and be it further

Resolved: That the General Assembly of the state of Vermont petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation similar to that introduced by Vermont Congressman James Jeffords (H.R. 7626) to provide federal funds to assist states in complying with section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and to enact legislation (H.R. 9761) to increase the federal share of special education costs under P.L. 94-142 to 40 percent immediately, rather than moving up gradually from the 5 percent level as currently authorized, and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this joint resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Agency of Health, Education and Welfare and the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

Approved: February 14, 1978. ●

NORTHEAST COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, April 6, I was privi-

leged to address a rally of several hundred persons in Philadelphia who came together to demonstrate their concern for the administration's policies in the Middle East.

The rally was organized by the Northeast Council of Synagogues, a coordinating body for 15 synagogues in northeast Philadelphia.

Those in attendance, Mr. Speaker, were unanimous in their feeling that the administration is making a serious error in proposing the sale of fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia and Egypt. I joined other speakers in pointing out that the sales will create greater instability and more tension in the Middle East, and will lead to a higher level of violence should a conflict take place.

Participants in the program also urged President Carter to not apply pressure on Israel to make concessions which will endanger her security. At the conclusion of the event, the following resolution was adopted by acclamation. I would like to offer it for the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A RESOLUTION

Whereas Israel is facing a crisis in the world arena more threatening and more deadly than any war she has ever fought, and

Whereas this conflict finds Israel being buffeted on one hand by an Arab diplomatic effort that includes oil blackmail and on the other hand by a most serious change in the position of the United States, and

Whereas Israel is a homeland, a nation, a heritage and a people brutalized by oppression but sustained by hope; driven through persecution but maintained by an eternal dream; challenged in war but proud in victory and prayerful for peace, and

Whereas Israel is a symbol of freedom of faith and of tradition to men of all religious beliefs, and

Whereas the survival of Israel demands the outward and public expression of concern and support by Americans of all religious beliefs and ethnic traditions,

Now, therefore, we the members of the Northeast Synagogue Council and the Northeast Jewish Community call for the Carter Administration to unite and give positive support to the State of Israel, its firmest ally in the Middle East.●

CHARLES S. V. SANNER

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of a native Frederick County Marylander and highly respected citizen of Frederick, Mr. Charles S. V. Sanner.

Certain individuals touch the lives of people around them with great influence, and Charles Sanner was a moving force in his community and State. It is with a great sense of personal loss that I note his passing.

Mr. Sanner was president of Sanner Realty Co., and had served as president of the Frederick Association of Insurance Agents, president of the Frederick Real Estate Board, chairman of the Frederick County Insurance Committee, chairman of the Agents Advisory Committee, director of the Montgomery Mutual Insur-

ance Co., and on the agents advisory committee of the Travelers Insurance Co., Baltimore.

Giving tireless leadership and encouragement to the business and civic communities, Mr. Sanner was involved with the Frederick County Chamber of Commerce, Frederick Rotary Club, Frederick YMCA, Hood College, American Legion, and was particularly devoted to the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Although Mr. Sanner's contributions are too numerous to list here, his services will long be remembered and appreciated. He will be greatly missed by his wife, Pat, and family, friends and co-workers. I know you join me in extending the official sympathies of the House in honor of this unselfish and patriotic American.●

**HUMAN RIGHTS IN IRELAND DAY
PROCLAIMED IN KANSAS**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the State of Kansas has joined the growing national movement concerned with ongoing human rights violations which occur in Ireland. Senate Concurrent Resolution 1688 proclaiming March 17, 1978, as Human Rights Day for Ireland was passed by the Kansas Senate on March 16 and the House on the 17th.

The more States which adopt these types of measures the more impetus will be placed on the Congress for hearings. The importance of hearings cannot be minimized. It can allow for constructive discussion of the major issues which divide Ireland as well as the various proposals which could bring peace.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert the Kansas resolution which was provided to me by President Jack Keane of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. I praise the Kansas legislators for this important initiative.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1688
A concurrent resolution recommending that the Legislature declare March 17, 1978, as "Human Rights Day For Ireland"

Whereas, St. Patrick's Day is an appropriate time for all citizens to recall the many contributions made by the Irish people to the history and culture of the United States and to the State of Kansas. It is a source of pride, which all citizens can share in, that so many Irish men and women have helped to build and develop this great country; and

Whereas, Nine men who signed the Declaration of Independence were of Irish descent and thousands of Irish people fought in this young nation's Revolutionary Army; and

Whereas, The generosity, warmth and kindness of the Irish have made them a welcomed addition to the melting pot of America; and

Whereas, Ireland today is torn apart by violence. A country cannot be joined by such violence, but must be joined by a common effort by both the North and the Republic, by Catholics and Protestants to establish a system of government in which both communities will live in economic, political and

social harmony. It is the love that each Irish man and woman has for their fine country that will create the foundation of a peaceful Ireland; and

Whereas, Not all Irish eyes are smiling on March 17: Now therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That we hereby declare March 17, 1978, as "Human Rights Day for Ireland", to focus both world and state attention to the trouble in Ireland and to show that we are concerned about the human rights, justice and peace of all the people of Ireland; and

Be it further resolved: That the Secretary of State forward an enrolled copy of this resolution to Mr. B. M. Watters, President, Jackson County Ancient Order of Hibernians, 5850 Central, Kansas City, Missouri 64113, Mr. Jack Keane, National President of Ancient Order of Hibernians, 7648 Grant Haven Dr., Afton, Missouri 63123, Mr. John W. Duffy, National Secretary of Ancient Order of Hibernians, 235 Wadsworth Ave., New York, New York 10033, and Ambassador John G. Molloy, 2234 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

I hereby certify that the above CONCURRENT RESOLUTION originated in the SENATE, and was adopted by that body March 16, 1978.

ROSS O. DOYEN,
President of the Senate.

LU KENNEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the House March 17, 1978.

JOHN CARLIN,
Speaker of the House.

GENEVA SEWARD,
Chief Clerk of the House.●

HUMPHREY-HAWKINS: AN IMPORTANT FIRST STEP

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House passage of H.R. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, demonstrated a willingness of this Congress to begin the task of reactivating our economy, which for so long has squandered our most important resource—the talent and energy of the American people. I would like to submit to my colleagues an editorial by the Christian Science Monitor on the new House version of H.R. 50, as I feel it accurately summarizes the bill's scope and purpose:

Let us assume that the Senate will pass the Humphrey-Hawkins jobs bill as the House of Representatives did last week. Then comes the hard part: ensuring the legislation is carried out to the best of its intentions. It gives the White House a mandate all too easy to avoid unless the Congress and public insist that it be followed through in good faith.

The Senate should not pass the bill as a deserved monument to Sen. Hubert Humphrey but as what Sen. Muriel Humphrey calls "an essential first step in moving America toward a new era of full employment and vigorous, stable economic growth."

Seen in this measured way, the bill should escape the danger of raising false hopes about a federally guaranteed end to unemployment. (It is not a jobs bill in the sense of creating or funding jobs.) And the emphasis on "stable economic growth" is

a reminder that the bill does not forget the control of inflation while placing jobs for everyone willing and able to work at the center of government policy.

Note that jobs and growth are combined in the title of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act. Unlike the landmark Employment Act of 1946, which neglected the problem of inflation, Humphrey-Hawkins makes price stability a goal along with its effort, three decades later, to fulfill the spirit of the earlier act.

To combat inflation Humphrey-Hawkins proposes such measures as stockpiling critical raw materials, strongly enforcing anti-trust laws, and instituting early warning systems to prepare against industrial capacity shortages. Suppose the mandated jobs goals—3 percent adult unemployment and 4 percent overall unemployment within five years of passage—conflict with inflation control. Then the bill allows the president to propose modifications of the goals.

It suggests governmental avenues of attacking structural unemployment through such means as targeted revenue sharing and public works. But the main thrust is toward use of the private sector and appropriate government policies to foster it. Gone is the specter seen in the original bill of generous government jobs drawing people away from the private sector.

Doubters on one side now call Humphrey-Hawkins, as adjusted to satisfy President Carter, a "sanitized" or toothless document, a paper tiger. On the other side, there are estimates of the billions of dollars required if the unemployment reductions are seriously sought.

Yet is there any economic goal more worthy of investment than ensuring jobs for all who want to work, especially in view of America's traditional commitment to and benefit from the work ethic? And even the sanitized Humphrey-Hawkins takes the unprecedented steps of requiring the president each year to state explicit employment goals and recommend the fiscal and monetary policies to achieve these goals. The Federal Reserve System would have to submit a written report on how its monetary policies were designed to support the president's numerical goals for employment, prices, and production.

Would such statements and reports become just rhetoric and more rhetoric? Not in the hands of a responsible president, a cooperative Federal Reserve Board, and a Congress diligent enough to demand its legislation not be ignored and to follow through with action.●

VIGIL FOR FREEDOM

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the "vigil for freedom" on behalf of Soviet Jewish families and individuals who are being refused permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union, but I am disheartened that the family for whom I spoke last year must again be the subject of my plea this year. The Inditsky family of Moscow is still waiting—for 7 years now—they are still waiting for permission from Soviet authorities to join their relatives in Israel.

Solomon Inditsky, his wife, Khana, their daughter, Isabella Novikova, and

their grandson, Mark, have applied four times for permission to emigrate. Each request has been denied. Last year Mark became a Bar Mitzvah in a private apartment in Moscow. He could not be called to the Torah in the synagogue—authorities would not allow it because this 14-year-old is a refusenik.

Once again, I join with the pleas of their family that the Inditskys be allowed to emigrate and join their relatives in Israel.●

ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES IN CIVIL SUITS INVOLVING THE UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, a private person who is involved in litigation with the U.S. Government or one of its agencies or employees must bear the fees and expenses of attorneys. Only under a handful of statutes may such private party recover its counsel fees. Indeed prior to 1966, a private person could not even recover its costs of litigation (as distinguished from counsel fees). In that year, Congress amended the law to allow courts to award costs (but not attorney fees) against the Government when a private litigant prevailed.

Since 1966, individuals and organizations representing a wide variety of interests have asked the Congress to take the second step of repealing the prohibition against the award of attorney fees against the Government. In a few limited areas, such as under the Freedom of Information Act, Congress has responded to such requests. In addition a number of bills have been introduced which, to varying degrees, would modify or totally abrogate the existing rule.

For the past 2 years, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, on which I serve, under the able leadership of Chairman KASTENMEIER, has explored various proposals in the attorney fee area. In 1976 we reported the Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976, which became Public Law 94-559. More recently we have examined other possible corrective action, including the question whether the prohibition against awarding fees in Government litigation should be removed.

At the suggestion of Chairman KASTENMEIER, I have undertaken to study this matter in greater detail. After consulting with a large number of groups and individuals, I have concluded that legislative action should be taken to permit private parties to recover their attorney fees when they prevail in litigation with the Government. Consequently, yesterday I introduced H.R. 12088 which would authorize the courts to award attorney fees and expenses to a prevailing party, other than the United States, in any civil action brought by or against the Government or one of its agencies, officers, or employees.

The bill would codify the dual standard for recovering such fees and expenses which the Supreme Court adopted in *Newman against Piggie Park Enterprises* and *Christiansburg Garment Co. against Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*. The essence of the dual standard is that prevailing plaintiffs should ordinarily recover their counsel fees in the absence of circumstances which would render such an award unjust. In contrast, prevailing defendants would recover their fees only if they could show that the action of the United States "was brought without foundation, vexatiously, frivolously, or in bad faith." The quoted words, which are in the bill, are drawn directly from the *Christiansburg Garment* case.

The rationale of the dual standard rests on the proposition that, "when a district court awards counsel fees to a prevailing plaintiff, it is awarding them against a violator of Federal law," as the Supreme Court observed in *Christiansburg Garment*. In contrast, a prevailing defendant does "not appear before the court cloaked in a mantle of public interest," as the Third Circuit Court of Appeals noted.

The bill also codifies the emerging judicial doctrine that a prevailing plaintiff, at least in some circumstances, may recover counsel fees expended before an administrative agency in cases where the litigant must first appear before such an agency. In many instances a person seeking to challenge adverse agency action must first go to the agency to seek relief or to present its case. Only then can the person proceed into the courts to secure a judicial ruling on the correctness of the administrative determination. The bill gives the court discretion to award the fees spent before the agency when the judicial action arises directly out of the administrative proceeding.

In addition the bill codifies court decisions which allows the award of attorney fees and expenses at an interim stage of the litigation. Recognizing that some litigation does not come to a resolution quickly, the courts have awarded such fees at important stages of the case prior to the entry of a final judgment. For example, plaintiffs will often seek preliminary relief to protect their rights at an early stage of the litigation. Indeed, issuance of a preliminary injunction may effectively resolve the controversy even though a final order is never entered, or entered many months later. When a court enters an order which "determines substantial rights of the parties," it should have the discretion to award fees at that stage of the cause. In *Bradley against Richmond School Board*, the Supreme Court approved such interim awards.

Of course, a plaintiff who wins a preliminary ruling may not ultimately win the lawsuit. Thus, it may be argued, it is not fair to make the defendant pay an interim award when the defendant may eventually prevail. To guard against such unjust enrichment, the bill authorizes the courts, when they award interim fees, to require the plaintiff to post a bond covering the amount of the award. In this

manner the defendant's interests will be sufficiently protected while, at the same time, securing to the plaintiff its right to an interim award.

Once the court has determined that a prevailing party is entitled to attorney fees and expenses, then it must approve an appropriate amount. Because the circumstances of each case vary, the bill commits this decision to the sound discretion of the courts. It is noted, however, that the courts should recognize existing standards which have been developed through the years to guide the exercise of that discretion. In *Johnson* against *Georgia Highway Express, Inc.*, for example, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals listed 12 factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of awards, including the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, the skill needed to present the case, the customary fee for similar work, and the amount received in damages, if any. These standards are discussed at greater length in House Report 94-1558 and Senate Report 94-1011, which accompanied the 1976 Fees Awards Act.

H.R. 12088 also amends the Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976. It would repeal the Allen amendment which permits a private defendant in tax cases brought by the Government to recover attorney fees upon a showing that the case was brought frivolously, vexatiously, or in bad faith. Senator ALLEN himself has expressed his disagreement with the court decisions which have narrowly construed his amendment. H.R. 12088 would correct the deficiencies which Senator ALLEN perceives in the 1976 Awards Act. Because my bill would allow taxpayer plaintiffs who prevail in suits brought against the United States, including those in the tax court, to recover their attorney fees, the Allen amendment is no longer needed.

The bill corrects two other deficiencies in the 1976 Awards Act. That statute allows prevailing parties to recover their counsel fees in cases instituted under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Together those titles prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin in certain federally assisted programs or activities. Title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 have similar provisions which protect the rights of handicapped persons and older Americans. H.R. 12088 would add these two statutory provisions to the 1976 act so that civil suits brought under them would have the benefit of the Fees Awards Act of 1976. I should add that I recently joined my good friend Chairman PEPPER on his bill which would amend the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 to authorize private suits expressly and to provide for attorney fees in such actions.

H.R. 12088 does not repeal any existing statute which permits counsel fees to be awarded against the United States. There are presently about a handful of such acts. They would continue in force. If a prevailing party has an option of seeking fees under a current statute or

under H.R. 12088, such party could choose the law under which fees are claimed, unless existing law expressly prohibited such option. For example, under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 406(b), the court may award an attorney's fee:

out of, and not in addition to, the amount of such past-due benefits. In case of any such judgment, no other fee may be payable or certified for payment for such representation except as provided in this paragraph.

H.R. 12088 would also require the Comptroller General to prepare an annual report for the Congress which would describe the nature and size of awards made under the law. This would permit the appropriate committees to evaluate the implementation of the statute to determine whether any modifications are needed. It would be a useful tool in exercising oversight responsibilities in this critical area.

Finally H.R. 12088 continues the existing rule regarding the award of costs in cases involving the United States. The prevailing party, including the Government, is entitled to recover its costs of litigation, such as filing and witness fees, certain transcript and deposition expenses, and similar items. The bill omits the reference to 28 U.S.C. 1920, contained in current law, because the courts have not restricted the award of costs only to the items listed in section 1920. Dropping the reference to section 1920 places the United States on an exact parity with the private litigant, which was the original objective of the 1966 legislation. This technical change conforms to the aims of the earlier amendment.

Chairman KASTENMEIER has advised me that hearings on H.R. 12088 will occur on April 26 and 27. Any person interested in submitting testimony on this matter should contact Ms. Gail Higgins Fogarty on the subcommittee staff (225-3926). A copy of the bill is inserted in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 12088

A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of reasonable attorney fees and expenses to the prevailing party (other than the United States) in any civil action brought by or against the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2412 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2412. Costs and attorney fees

"(a) (1) In any civil action brought by or against the United States, any agency thereof, or any official thereof acting in an official capacity, the court having jurisdiction of such action (including the Tax Court of the United States)—

"(A) may award costs to the prevailing party; and

"(B) may award reasonable attorney fees and expenses to the prevailing party (other than the United States or an agency or official thereof), except that the court may award reasonable attorney fees and expenses to a prevailing defendant only if the court determines that the action was brought without foundation, vexatiously, frivolously, or in bad faith.

"(2) Costs and attorney fees and expenses awarded under this section to the prevailing party in a civil action shall be paid by the

opposing party, except that a non-Federal litigant joined with the United States as a party in such action shall not be liable for the payment of attorney fees and expenses.

"(b) A judgment in a civil action awarding reasonable attorney fees and expenses under this section may include any such fees and expenses which were incurred in any administrative proceeding which is the subject of review in such action or incurred in any appeal or other review of such action.

"(c) (1) Upon the entry of any order which determines substantial rights of the parties in a civil action brought by or against the United States, any agency thereof, or any official thereof acting in an official capacity, the court may award interim costs and reasonable attorney fees and expenses to the prevailing party (other than the United States or an agency or official thereof) if the court, upon application of the prevailing party, determines that such party is likely to prevail on the merits in the action.

"(2) The court in its discretion may require the posting of a supersedeas bond by a prevailing party awarded interim costs and reasonable attorney fees and expenses under this subsection.

"(d) Payment of a judgment for costs and reasonable attorney fees and expenses shall be as provided in section 2414 and section 2517 of this title for the payment of judgments against the United States."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Costs." in the item relating to section 2412 and inserting in lieu thereof "Costs and attorney fees."

SEC. 2. Section 2414 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after the first undesignated paragraph thereof the following new undesignated paragraph:

"At the end of each fiscal year, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the amount of costs and attorney fees and expenses awarded during such fiscal year for payment by the United States (or any agency or official thereof) under section 2412 of this title or any other provision of law which authorizes such awards. Each such report shall describe the nature and amount of the awards, the claims involved in the civil action, and other relevant information which will aid the Congress in evaluating the scope and impact of such awards."

SEC. 3. Section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) is amended by striking out "or in any civil action or proceeding by or on behalf of the United States of America, to enforce, or charging a violation of, a provision of the United States Internal Revenue Code" and inserting in lieu thereof "title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975".

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall affect any right of any person to recover costs and attorney fees and expenses under any other provision of Federal Law.●

TEXAS UTILITIES COMPANY WINS EDISON AWARD FOR LIGNITE USE

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my State of Texas sometimes is associated in the public mind with oil and gas, and not coal. And yet it is going to be necessary for utilities in Texas to convert to coal for power generation, as must utilities in other States.

Yesterday marked a significant step in that conversion process when the Edison Electric Institute presented its Edison Award to the Texas Utilities Co. system for innovative development of lignite fuel resources in the generation of electricity. The system includes Dallas Power & Light Co., Texas Electric Service Co., Texas Power & Light Co., Texas Utilities Fuel Co., Texas Utilities Generating Co., and Texas Utilities Services, Inc.

The Edison Award, highest honor of the electric utility industry, was presented to T. L. Austin, Jr., chairman of the board of Texas Utilities Co. at the 46th annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute, being held in Houston.

The text of the award reads as follows:

EDISON AWARD, 1978

For demonstrated foresight and aggressive action in reducing its dependence on natural gas from 100 percent of electric generation in 1971 to 66 percent in 1977, for development of lignite as a low-cost fuel alternative, and for conducting exemplary reclamation of the land mined for lignite, all representing highly constructive steps in making the best use of fuel resources, meeting energy needs and accomplishing environmental goals to the benefit of its customers and its service area, Texas Utilities Company System, consisting of Dallas Power & Light Company, Texas Electric Service Company, Texas Power & Light Company, Texas Utilities Fuel Company, Texas Utilities Generating Company and Texas Utilities Services Inc., is declared the recipient of the Edison Award for 1977. ●

GOVERNOR ROMERO OF PUERTO RICO TAKES A LEADERSHIP POSITION REDUCING UNNECESSARILY HIGH TAX RATES AND ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC GROWTH

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was reported that our friend, Gov. Carlos Romero Barcelo of Puerto Rico, will soon propose a dramatic reduction in individual income tax rates, which go up as high as 83 percent in Puerto Rico. A key feature of the Barcelo program is a reduction in the highest rate from 83 to 50 percent. He notes that all the rates from 50 to 83 percent raise only \$12 million per year for the Government and the Governor expects the increase in output which would result from such a rate reduction to make up the loss tenfold.

This is precisely the same point I have made in offering a 30-percent reduction in the U.S. tax rates. At present the 70- to 50-percent rates raise only about 6 percent of individual income tax revenue. But the cost of such high rates is to discourage work, investment, and entrepreneurship so that much more revenue is lost than gained.

I hope my colleagues will read this article about Governor Barcelo and join us in a similar effort to reduce tax rates and restore real growth to our economy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 12, 1978]

PUERTO RICO ON THE MOVE

Believe it or not, one of the most popular fellows in Puerto Rico these days is Fred Martinez, director of internal revenue. Unlike our IRS director, Darth Vader, who likes to tax the wings off flies, Mr. Martinez a few weeks back let it slip to the San Juan Star that his boss, the governor, was planning some big tax-rate cuts on personal incomes to get the island economy off its bottom.

The Star rhapsodized editorially. After all, Puerto Rico has progressive personal tax rates that make U.S. rates look benign, rising to 83% at the top. A further clincher is a prohibition against separate returns by husbands and wives, which any taxi driver in San Juan can tell you encourages divorce.

The only trouble was that Gov. Carlos Romero Barcelo had not wanted the news to slip out before he had his legislative package designed and defensible. He issued a statement denying the Star article, and the Star, which is not especially cozy with his Republican administration, blasted him editorially for not coming through. The populace muttered about running Mr. Martinez for governor.

But Gov. Romero has now put himself clearly in the forefront of the tax cutting movement. On Monday First Boston Corp. hosted a breakfast seminar in Manhattan to hear the governor and his economic team outline their economic strategy. The wall-to-wall financiers heard Mr. Romero announce publicly that come Jan. 1, the legislature willing, there will be major reductions in the island's personal tax rates.

This is cheering news. There are still no specifics, but we would not be surprised if the proposal that does go to the legislature calls for a cut to 50% in the top bracket and adjustments across-the-board to bring the personal rates in line with the mainland's. Economist Arthur Laffer of the University of Southern California, a consultant to Puerto Rican Treasury Secretary Perez, has been urging such reductions. The theory embodied in the "Laffer curve" is that when tax rates are too high, reducing them will spur the economy and thus actually boost government revenue.

The highest rates—those at the top of the progressive schedule—produce almost no revenue for the Puerto Rican government, but stand simply as a barrier to productivity. What good does it do to attract financial capital from the mainland with business-tax holidays when top flight managerial talent flees the withering steepness of the personal taxes? Local professional talent bails out too, and there's nobody left to pay the top rates.

In 1975, with total island revenues topping \$1.5 billion, the personal brackets from 50% to 83% produced a mere \$12 million for the treasury over and above what a top rate of 50% would have yielded. Secretary Perez judges that the economy and tax base would expand so handsomely at the lower top rate that the implied revenue loss of \$12 million would be made up tenfold.

It's all about time. The currency inflation of the last several years has been especially brutal to Puerto Rico precisely because its personal rates are so much more progressive than the mainland's. The economy has been barely limping along, with unemployment hovering around 20% for the last few years. The preceding Democratic administration made matters worse by trying to fight inflation with a 5% surtax atop all the other personal taxes. Gov. Romero peeled this away last year.

His commitment Monday to peel the personal rates further is an important breakthrough for Puerto Rico. The commonwealth is no stranger to tax incentives as a key to productivity, but until now it has been to-

tally preoccupied with luring mainland capital and mainland enterprises. The lower personal rates for Puerto Ricans will invite internal generation of capital and enterprises.

The moves will be carefully watched throughout the Caribbean, and ought to be watched throughout the Third World, most of which has tax structures similar to Puerto Rico's. For that matter, the experiment ought to be watched here on the mainland too, as a controlled experiment, with the Laffer curve. If Gov. Romero does cut personal income tax rates, especially at the top, and it does boost the Puerto Rican economy, we all will have learned a great deal about economic expansion. ●

GREAT REDWOOD COMPROMISE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, legislation has recently been enacted almost doubling the size of the Redwood National Park. Many Members voted for this bill under the mistaken idea that the redwoods were endangered, and that park expansion was necessary to save the tall trees. While the environmental benefits of park expansion are of dubious value, the economic hardship and human suffering this legislation will inflict upon the people of Humboldt County is only beginning to manifest itself.

An article was recently published in New Times magazine and reprinted in the San Francisco Chronicle. It provides some sobering second thoughts on the "Great Redwood Compromise." I believe my colleagues will find the points of view expressed by the author, Arthur Zich, informative and thought-provoking:

THE GREAT REDWOOD COMPROMISE

(By Arthur Zich)

"A triumph for the majesty of redwoods," clarified Senate majority whip Alan Cranston.

"A great tribute to the Sierra Club," declared Representative Philip Burton, the author of the bill in the House. "We now have a national park worthy of the name, that will preserve this treasure of trees for all humanity and for all generations to come."

And who could argue with that? After years of wrangling, the Redwood National Park expansion bill had finally cleared the House and Senate and was on its way for virtually certain signature by the President. No fewer than 48,000 acres have been added to the park. The Tall Trees Grove—repository of the world's first, third and sixth tallest trees—had been spared the depredations of rapacious loggers. *Sequoia sempervirens*, the noblest and most enduring symbol of man's concern for the land, had been spared. Right?

Well, not exactly. Whatever else the bill eventually achieves, it has amply demonstrated that truth is the first casualty of politics.

The bill that rang such winning encomiums from its authors raises real questions. Humboldt county, an area economically bound to the timber industry and already beset with a chronic 12-14 percent unemployment rate. It removes a sizable chunk of the world's finest redwood timberland from

the public weal even as the House Agriculture Committee warns that the nation will soon be facing a critical timber shortage. It commits taxpayers to an initial outlay of some \$400 million and an eventual much greater expenditure.

All that might yet be tolerable if the bill did what it was supposed to do. Unfortunately, the bill of itself does nothing to remove the threat to the Tall Trees. And begging the congressman's pardon, it does not add 48,000 acres of redwoods to Redwood National Park.

The unhappy fact is that the threat to the Tall Trees comes from gravel deposits in Redwood Creek, which flows past the grove, and these are already in place—washed down from heavily logged, geologically unstable upland slopes. Says park superintendent George Von Der Lippe, "If all the logging operations in the watershed were to stop tomorrow, the threat to the trees, such as it is, would still be there."

As for the redwoods, less than 10,000 acres of old growth—the really big trees—are among the acreage the Burton bill will buy. The rest is either young second-growth timber or land that has been logged off entirely. The sad truth is that for the foreseeable future, Redwood National Park will remain the ecological B-1 it has always been—only bigger, more expensive and, in many places, uglier.

Since its establishment in 1968, the park has cost \$172 million—not quite twice the \$92 million Congress originally ponied up for it, but well over twice the price of all the other parks in the national park system combined. And it is not paid for yet; some \$110 million is still hanging fire in the courts. The park has never drawn near the 950,000 visitor days its chief proponent, former Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, predicted.

Last year, visitor days totaled a scant 34,000—3.6 percent of the projection. That placed the park 32nd out of 37 national parks in terms of visitors; in terms of campers it ranked even lower. "Last year," says Von Der Lippe, "we had 2259 overnights in Redwood Creek."

It was reverence for the redwoods that provided the cutting edge for the bill's swift passage. But a good deal of that veneration was better rooted in rhetoric than it was in reality. Contrary to popular notion, *Sequoia sempervirens* is neither rare, fragile nor slow-growing.

Some 400 million of the trees now stand along the 500-mile-long coastal corridor from southern Oregon to San Simeon. Botanists call it one of the ruggedest trees in the world. (It is no sooner cut than the stumps send out any number of sprouts, each of which is capable of soaring into a full size tree.) The lumber companies are reforesting redwoods at a rate of around three million trees a year. And for good, sound business reasons: *Sequoia sempervirens* is the fastest growing conifer in North America—and its market price, even in California, is out of sight.

It was a bad political compromise that brought the park into being. The Sierra Club and other environmentalist groups wanted 78,000 acres encompassing most of the Redwood Creek watershed, then owned by Arcata National Louisiana-Pacific and Simpson Timber Company, plus the Jeddiah Smith, Prairie Creek and Del Norte State Parks. Congress' \$92 million ceiling whittled the size down to 28,000 confiscated acres; California refused to donate its parklands. And the Tall Trees, whatever serenity they provided for visitors, created one monstrous headache for park planners.

The problem was that the bulk of desired old-growth redwoods stood in a clump at the mouth of Redwood Creek, while the Tall Trees stood alone about eight miles upstream. To connect the two, park planners created

"the Worm," a narrow strip of parkland running 14 miles upstream and about a quarter-mile out from each of the banks. In effect, the park had the creekbed with the Tall Trees intact; the timber companies held the watershed's uphill flanks.

To the public, it seemed a hard-struck balance between productive forestry and pristine preservation. To the Sierra Club, it was only round one.

The cutting, conservationists charged, brought down everything from landslides to streamside trees. But their principal concerns were two. First, it shattered the aesthetic experience of the park: patches of clear-cut hills above the Worm were denuded, scarred and all too visible from inside the park; the sometime whine of chain saws, crash of trees and rumble of trucks intruded on the serenity the park was supposed to provide. Second, and more ominous, the cutting process left barren hills to erode in winter rains, sending enormous quantities of silt and gravel cascading into Redwood Creek, where it piled up on the streambed above and alongside Tall Trees Grove.

The danger was threefold. The gravel build-up might be swept along on the periodic floods that inundate the Grove and gradually tear away the Tall Trees' bark and the life-sustaining cambium layer beneath. The floods might leave a dump of gravel around the trunks, which would in effect suffocate the trees. Or the creekbed gravel might cause the water table to rise beneath the trees, and drown their root systems.

The industry cried: Not so. But the state agreed, at least to the extent of tightening up on logging operations in the area. In 1974, the California Forest Practices Act—the toughest logging law in the nation—went into effect. And over the next two years the timber industry was forced into "voluntary agreements" with state and federal authorities that further restricted its autonomy.

Henceforth, wherever possible, timber men had to use cable-yarding instead of old tractor-yarding harvesting techniques. This meant that fallen trees would be slung on overhead cables to truck landings instead of being dragged by earth-gouging tractors. Clear-cut sites were strictly limited in acreage; adjacent stands would not be harvested for a minimum of three years. Within five years of a harvest, a logged-off piece of land had to be covered with three-year-old seedlings. "If those seedlings don't take the first year," says Fred Henschell, 40, the forester in charge of Louisiana-Pacific's big tree nursery near Little River, you'd better get your butt out replanting the next year or you'll soon be breaking the law."

The measures are working. "It's true," says park chief Von Der Lippe. "There's been a great deal of improvement in timber logging in this area." But the Sierra Club and related environmentalists scented all-out victory—and went for it. A flood of scaring pamphlets poured out of environmentalists' offices, complete with grisly photos of logged-off land, out-of-context excerpts from scientific studies, and the solemn, treacly poetry of Friends of the Earth chief David Brower. The thrust of it all: the timber men were cut-and-run land rappers; the redwoods were in imminent danger, the situation was critical.

It made good copy; it gave arm-chair environmentalists an uplifting cause that required neither thought nor action. And logging was undeniably ugly until second-growth took hold. But this view ignored several pertinent considerations. Over the previous decade, the cut-and-run land rappers had invested \$160 million in new plant facilities in the area. The Sierra Club scheme meant seizure of thousands of acres of immensely productive property—private property at that. And there were alternatives. ●

MONTHLY LIST OF GAO REPORTS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the monthly list of GAO reports includes summaries of reports which were prepared by the staff of the General Accounting Office. The February 1978 list includes:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Additional Cost Of The All-Volunteer Force. FPCD-78-11, February 6.

Opportunities Exist For Substantial Savings In Administration Of Military Skill Training Programs. FPCD-78-13, February 14.

Management And Use Of Army Enlisted Personnel—What Needs To Be Done. FPCD-78-6, February 16.

Can The Army Provide Logistic Support For Its Troops In A Conventional Defense Of Free Europe? LCD-77-208, February 16.

Status Of The Navy's Vertical Short Take-off And Landing Aircraft. PSAD-78-61, February 23.

Can The Army's \$2.8 Billion Program To Modernize The CH-47 Helicopter Be Improved? PSAD-78-18, February 24.

Analysis Of Department Of Defense Unobligated Budget Authority. PAD-78-34, January 13.

Analysis Of The Need For Additional Family Housing At The Navy's Trident Submarine Base. CED-78-49, February 9.

Philadelphia Naval Regional Medical Center Is Badly Deteriorated And Unsafe. LCD-78-301, February 17.

Questionable Practices Of The Military Minor Construction Program. LCD-77-356, February 14.

Letter reports

How the Air Force awards contracts for repairing J75 afterburner cylinders. PSAD-78-78, February 16.

Work measurement system for real property maintenance used by the U.S. Army in Europe is of little value; improvements suggested. LCD-78-312, February 16.

The Navy should make sure that incentive provisions in noncompetitive contracts motivate contractors to keep costs at a minimum; the case of a contract awarded to Lockheed for two submarine tenders and related items. PSAD-78-82, February 21.

Answers to questions about the Reserve Officers Training Corps. FPCD-78-17, February 23.

Operation of housing on Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, by the Roswell Housing Authority. LCD-78-309, January 25.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Impact On Trade Of Changes In Taxation Of U.S. Citizens Employed Overseas. ID-78-13, February 21.

How The United States Can And Should Improve Its Funding Of International Joint Commission Activities. ID-78-10, February 8.

Improved Management Needed Over The Agency For International Development's Operating Costs. ID-78-15, February 14.

East-West Center—Progress And Problems. ID-78-11, February 15.

The American University In Cairo: Alternatives For U.S. Government Support. ID-78-20, February 17.

GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

NASA's Resource Data Base and Techniques For Supporting, Planning, And Controlling Programs Need Improvement. PSAD-77-78, May 19, 1977.

The Maritime Administration's Evaluation Of The End Products Of Research And Development Contracts With Private, Profit-making Firms. PSAD-78-4, January 27.

ENERGY

The Magnitude Of The Federal Solar Energy Program And The Effects Of Different Levels Of Funding. EMD-78-27, February 2. Better Planning Needed To Deal With Shifting Regional Energy Demand. EMD-78-35, February 22.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Improved Formulation And Presentation Of Water Resources Project Alternatives Provide A Basis For Better Management Decisions. CED-78-42, February 1.

Letter reports

The Department of the Interior should improve the accuracy of its recording and reporting of accounts receivable and improve followup actions on delinquent accounts. FGMSD-77-66, February 3.

Advantages and disadvantages of authorizing general water resources development plans rather than individual projects. CED-78-41, January 30.

AGRICULTURE

How Good Are School Lunches? CED-78-22, February 3.

Opportunities For Improving Internal Auditing In The Department Of Agriculture. CED-78-28, February 9.

Letter report

Progress of Agriculture's attempts to improve the national gain inspection system hampered by slow acquisition and training of staff. CED-78-23, February 27.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

New Interstate Truckers Should Be Granted Temporary Operating Authority More Readily. CED-78-32, February 24.

Ways To Increase The Number, Type, And Timeliness Of 8(a) Procurement Contracts. CED-78-48, February 1.

TRANSPORTATION

Is The Administrative Flexibility Originally Provided To The U.S. Railway Association Still Needed? CED-78-19, February 22.

Linking The Americas—Progress And Problems Of The Darien Gap Highway. PSAD-78-65, February 23.

Letter reports

Recommended changes in the Federal Aviation Administration's proposed regulations setting noise limits for supersonic aircraft. CED-78-52, January 31.

Use of helicopters by the Coast Guard to provide emergency medical services in inland areas. CED-78-54, February 10.

Information on the Coast Guard's accounting system. CED-78-35, January 10.

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The District of Columbia Needs A Program To Identify Vacant Houses And Get Them Back On The Market. GGD-78-25, February 22.

Stronger Federal Enforcement Needed To Uphold Fair Housing Laws. CED-78-21, February 2.

Letter reports

How planned reorganization of the Department of Housing and Urban Development will affect the State of Kansas. CED-78-53, February 13.

Problems encountered in construction of a HUD-sponsored multifamily housing project in Naugatuck, Connecticut. CED-78-40, January 31.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development should determine the extent of construction problems in Government subsidized housing projects. CED-78-39, February 14.

HEALTH

Need To Improve Administration Of A Carcinogen Testing And Carcinogenesis Research Contract. HRD-78-44, February 10.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission Has No Assurance That Product Defects Are Being Reported And Corrected. HRD-78-48, February 14.

Actions Needed To Improve The Nutrition Program For The Elderly. HRD-78-58, February 23.

Letter reports

Review of financial arrangements for and procedures followed in setting up the May 1977 White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. HRD-78-47, February 1.

Reasons for errors in HEW's listing of physicians and group practices receiving over \$100,000 in Medicare payments. HRD-78-32, February 7.

How the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is carrying out requirements governing the use of Federal funds to pay sterilizations. HRD-78-74, February 27.

INCOME SECURITY

The Social Security Administration Needs To Improve Its Disability Claims Process. HRD-78-40, February 16.

Number Of Newly Arrived Aliens Who Receive Supplemental Security Income Needs To Be Reduced. HRD-78-50, February 22.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Further Actions Needed To Resolve VA's Educational Assistance Overpayment Problem. HRD-78-45, February 17.

Constructing New VA Hospital In Camden, New Jersey, Unjustified. HRD-78-51, February 6.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The FBI's System For Managing Investigative Resources And Measuring Results—Improvements Are Being Made. GGD-78-1, February 15.

U.S. Attorneys Do Not Prosecute Many Suspected Violators Of Federal Laws. GGD-77-86, February 27.

Handgun Control: Effectiveness And Costs. PAD-78-4, February 6.

What Can Be Done About Overcrowding In Long-Term Federal Correctional Facilities. PAD-78-50, February 10.

Housing Federal Prisoners In Non-Federal Facilities Is Becoming More Difficult. GGD-77-92, February 23.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Voting Rights Act—Enforcement Needs Strengthening. GGD-78-19, February 6.

Personnel Restrictions And Cutbacks In Executive Agencies: Need For Caution. FPCD-77-85, February 9.

Improvements Needed In Processing Civil Service Retirement Claims. FPCD-78-10, January 30.

Problems With Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines On Employee Selection Procedures Need To Be Resolved. FPCD-77-54, February 2.

The Federal Government's Bill Payment Performance Is Good But Should Be Better. FGMSD-78-16, February 24.

Accounting For Automatic Data Processing Costs Needs Improvement. FGMSD-78-14, February 7.

A Range Of Cost Measuring Risk And Uncertainty In Major Programs—An Aid To Decision-Making. PSAD-78-12, February 2.

The General Services Administration's Consumer Information Center. LCD-78-412, February 2.

Leasing Of Social Security Administration District And Branch Offices By The General Services Administration. LCD-78-313, February 7.

Audit Of Financial Transactions Of The Sergeant At Arms For The 12 Months Ended June 30, 1977. GGD-78-40, February 28.

Audit Of The Stationary Revolving Fund For The Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1977. GGD-78-33, February 22.

IRS Can Improve Its Programs To Collect Taxes Withheld By Employers. GGD-78-14, February 21.

Letter reports

Can the concept of "full funding"—providing funds for the total estimated cost of a program at its outset—be applied to more programs and activities in the Federal budget? FGMSD-78-18, February 23.

The General Services Administration should consider expanding the size of its internal audit staff. LCD-78-315, February 16.

Activities of the House of Representatives' Office Equipment Service for the year ended June 30, 1977. GGD-78-4, February 21.

GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE

Impact Of Antirecession Assistance On 15 State Governments. GGD-77-69, February 22.

Impact Of Antirecession Assistance On 16 County Governments. GGD-77-60, February 22.

Impact Of Antirecession Assistance On 21 City Governments. GGD-77-70, February 22.

The Federal Government Should But Doesn't Know The Cost Of Administering Its Assistance Programs. GGD-77-87, February 14.

Letter report

Impact of small quarterly payments of antirecession assistance—under \$2,000—on the ability of governments to provide basic services and reduce unemployment. GGD-78-30, February 22.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

More Federal Efforts Needed To Improve Indians' Standard Of Living Through Business Development. CED-78-50, February 15.

Controls Are Needed Over Indian Self-Determination Contracts, Grants, And Training And Technical Assistance Activities To Insure Required Services Are Provided To Indians. CED-78-44, February 15.

The Bureau Of Indian Affairs Needs To Determine How Well Its Indian Training Program Is Working And Assist Tribes In Their Training Efforts. CED-78-46, February 13.

Bureau Of Indian Affairs Not Operating Boarding Schools Efficiently. CED-78-56, February 15.

Questionable Need For All Schools Planned By The Bureau Of Indian Affairs. CED-78-55, February 15.

Information On Organization Of The Indian Education Resources Center. CED-78-57, February 15.

Tribal Participation In The Bureau Of Indian Affairs Budget System Should Be Increased. CED-78-62, February 15.

More Effective Controls Over Bureau Of Indian Affairs Administrative Costs Are Needed. FGMSD-78-17, February 15.

Letter report

How effective is coordination of Bureau of Indian Affairs activities with other Federal agencies? CED-78-47, February 8.

The Monthly List of GAO Reports and/or copies of the full texts are available from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, Room 4522, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Phone (202) 275-6241. ●

INFLATION: A NOTE TO MR. CARTER

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the President recently issued an anti-infla-

tion statement which was long on rhetoric and short of real substance. The American people were expecting more than they received in his message. Inflation is creating a terrible burden on all the people in our country.

For example, if a person earned \$10,000 last year and just received a 10 percent pay increase, he should not go out and spend that extra \$1,000. After taxes and inflation erode the raise, the taxpayer will have only \$102 in a real wage increase. Let us look at an example of a man and wife who both work and their combined earnings were \$20,000 last year. If they should receive a combined raise of \$2,000, they will have only \$231 in a real wage increase.

Those are two examples found in a study on the effects of Federal taxes and inflation on wage increases conducted by the United States League of Savings Association.

To put it bluntly, salary increases and proposed tax reductions will not even keep up with inflation and higher social security taxes. When the added taxes resulting from the passage of the energy program, if it is ever enacted by the Congress are added into the overall picture, the situation worsens.

Huge deficits, costly Government regulations, more bureaucracy—these are just a few of the causes of inflation, but they are causes which we can do something about. I hope that each Member of Congress will keep that in mind during the days ahead.

Recently, I read an article, "Inflation: A Note to Mr. Carter," by Vermont Royster in the March 22 edition of the Wall Street Journal. I believe that my colleagues will find it to be of great interest as inflation continues to be the No. 1 problem facing this country today:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1978]

INFLATION: A NOTE TO MR. CARTER

(By Vermont Royster)

I read in the papers that you and your economic advisers are puzzled by the sagging stock market and the collapsing dollar abroad and are urging everybody not to worry.

After all, the stock market is supposedly a concern only for the rich and nobody understands it anyway. As for the drop in the dollar on foreign exchange markets, that affects only firms doing business abroad, a few GIs in West Germany and some tourists who might better spend their money in this country. Besides, business is good, employment is up and the inflation rate last year was only 6 percent.

I have even read that some in your administration think there's good to come from the declining dollar. It's supposed to help stimulate exports.

But there are millions of people all over this country who, I'm afraid, view these matters differently. These are the people—and their name is indeed legion—who have their little stake in union pension funds or who have just tucked away some money in savings accounts or who have bought U.S. savings bonds on a payroll deduction plan.

They are not rich people. They may not be clever enough to see the interconnection between that sagging stock market, the declining dollar abroad and our domestic inflation. They are simply good, hard-working thrifty people who would like to have something for their old age besides Social

Security. But they can see clearly enough what's happening to them. And they can feel the pain.

Consider, to begin with, an individual who only five years ago thought he had a tidy nest egg in a union pension fund invested in American business. Five years ago confidence in America led him to expect his share in that fund would grow and he could look forward to the future without worry.

Quite the opposite has happened. In the intervening five years his share in that retirement fund has shrunk, not grown.

The shrinkage varies, but every fund I know of that has invested in the stocks of American business has shrunk. In one of the better managed, for one example, the loss in market value between December 31, 1972, and December 31, 1977, has been 10.3%. Others have fared worse.

SOME ECONOMIC JARGON

That loss is shared by each individual member of such a fund: His nestegg is smaller than it was five years ago. In the jargon of the economists he has suffered a negative compound interest rate, which is a fancy way of saying he has lost more money each year.

That should tell you what the sagging market has done to the ordinary pensioner—never mind what it has done to the rich. It may also give you an idea why people aren't rushing to invest in American business. In fact, the small investor has long since fled the stock market. From that you can deduce why capital formation is at such a worrisome low point and business is having to increase debt, rather than equity, to get money to replace equipment or for expansion.

That may strike you as puzzling, since in terms of dollars the earnings of most companies last year increased; why shouldn't that attract investors? The reason is that even unsophisticated people can see that those greater number of dollars apparently earned really buy less, whether or not they understand the earnings "deflator" that Charles Shultz computes over at the Economic Council.

In fact, the dollar loss in his pension fund isn't the only thing that has happened to the poor participant. Because of inflation, present dollars will buy only 68.4% of what those 1972 dollars bought. So in that particular example cited above, those 10.3% fewer dollars are worth only 68 cents each in the grocery store. That makes the poor pensioner's true loss of purchasing power well over a third, or about 38%.

If you take a longer span of time, say 10 years, the theft by inflation is worse. The dollar bill at the end of 1977 bought only about 57 percent of the same dollar in 1967.

Of course that affects not only those who, by pension funds or otherwise, have suffered in the stock market. Consider, for a different example, an individual who put his savings in a bank or savings and loan.

In some cases he thinks he is earning as much as 7 percent interest, which sounds like a lot. But on that 7 percent he has to pay taxes of 14 percent at the minimum rate: for someone with a modest \$6,000 taxable income the tax is 20 percent.

Thus even the minimum income tax rate reduces his apparent interest return to zero: That is, it just about equals the loss of his dollars' purchasing power at a 6 percent inflation rate. If he's paying 20 percent or more in taxes he's going backwards at a rapid rate. He doesn't have to be very sophisticated to understand he's in a bind.

But what has all this to do with that other vexing problem, the decline of the dollar on foreign exchange markets?

For a clue, ask yourself why any foreigner—Japanese, German or Arab oil sheik—would want to hold U.S. dollars. There's only one answer: for what those dol-

lars will buy of U.S. goods. Either the original holder intends to buy U.S. goods or sell his dollars to someone else who does. Either way, their value depends ultimately upon their purchasing power in this country.

With the purchasing value of the dollar steadily declining in our own country, why should we expect foreigners to be eager to buy or hold them? If it weren't for what's happening to the dollar at home we'd have less trouble with all those oil payments that so worry you. If it continues to decline we'll have worse trouble. Already the OPEC countries have begun to mutter about no longer accepting payment for their oil in dollars.

In short, everyone who has trusted the U.S. dollar—be he foreigner, pensioner or ordinary citizen-saver—feels cheated. That takes the mystery out of many things, from the stock market to the foreign exchange markets.

LONG-STANDING POLICIES, BUT

I am well aware that all these troubles can't be laid at your door. They are the consequence of long-standing policies reaching back to three Presidents before you, and the worst inflation occurred before you came to office.

But when you were running for President the country had the impression you were deeply concerned about all this. People thought you intended to do something about the size and cost of government, about the taxes this levied upon the people, about the inflationary effects of having to create money and credit to pay for huge deficits. They thought you would lift the burden of all this from the hard-working and thrifty, a class which includes those who labor as butchers, bakers and candlestick makers.

What we seem to have got instead is bigger government (that monstrous Energy Department), more costly government (a spending budget of over \$500 billion), a vastly bigger deficit (over \$60 billion) which assures continued inflation. Under the guise of Social Security payments this middle class even got a big tax increase, with more to come from your energy bill.

It may be, as we are told, that despite all this, future inflation can be held to "only" 6%. But even at that rate, as Dr. Schultze's computers can tell you, a 30-year-old will see the present dollar worth little more than a dime by the time he thinks of retiring at 65. He'll have to run very fast to keep ahead on his life insurance, his pension, his savings. If we have another eruption of double-digit inflation, he'll truly face a scary ride on a rollercoaster.

My guess is that people, here and abroad, are still bullish on America. I think they expect to see the stock market rise again, the dollar resume its trusted place in the world, their savings once more secure against erosion. At least they want to believe that with good leadership we will surmount these troubles as we have past ones.

But there is no puzzle about the stock market or the declining dollar, and it's no wonder people worry in the middle of the night.●

CRIME SUBCOMMITTEE TO HOLD THIRD HEARING ON CIGARETTE BOOTLEGGING

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled its third hearing on H.R. 8853,

H.R. 10066, H.R. 10807, and related bills which address the problem of racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes, for April 19, 1978, at 1:30 p.m. in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing will be to take testimony from the Members of Congress who have sponsored the major legislation on the subject of cigarette bootlegging.

Those Members wishing to testify or to submit a statement for the RECORD should address their requests to the House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, 207-E Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 (telephone: 202, 225-1695.) ●

WHAT IS THE SOUL OF AMERICA?

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, what makes some countries great and powerful and others less fortunate has been a topic of debate for centuries. Over the years, political philosophers have attempted to determine why countries repeatedly rise to power only to fall back into the wells of mediocrity. History has taught us many lessons that, if understood by countries such as America, could enable us to avoid the same pitfalls that eventually engulfed other world powers.

Mr. Vincent Murray, a long time Michigan resident and graduate of Manhattan College and the University of Detroit, recently addressed these subjects in a speech before the School of Government, Inc., in Detroit. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues his very timely words of wisdom:

"WHAT IS THE SOUL OF AMERICA?"

It is most fitting that your fine civic organization pauses between the birthdays of America's two greatest leaders to reflect on our nation's beginnings, its history, and its future. It has been said that, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and it is groups such as yours that must educate and inform on the responsibilities of good citizenship.

When the Declaration of Independence was completed and about to be announced to the world, a colonist in Philadelphia stopped Benjamin Franklin as he was leaving Independence Hall. He asked Franklin, "What have you given us, Sir?" He replied, "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it!" Franklin meant exactly that—it was up to all of us to maintain our government. Well, more than two centuries later the Republic still stands, not a perfect instrument, but by far the finest ever devised since the dawn of history for the government of an enlightened citizenry. The key word there is "enlightened" because our government works best when the people actively participate and study its workings. And if it ever ceases to work, it is solely because we, the people, have not done our part. At times in our history its existence has been sorely tried by wars, racial strife, economic crises, labor turbulence, corruption, and social upheavals. We have not come easily to the present position of world leadership. The soul of America has been shaped and molded in the ideals

of the founding fathers, in the toils and sacrifices of our pioneer ancestors, in the blood of heroes in world-wide wars, in the day-to-day life of ordinary people following ordinary pursuits, in our churches, our schools and in our homes.

How important is the soul of America? It is more important to the nation, its welfare, and its survival than our entire nuclear arsenal, or our industrial might, or our military forces. The will, the character, the national purpose, the self-discipline of our people count more than any tangible physical assets in the determination of our history and our future. That fact is proven by the rise and fall of world powers through-out history.

Some of us here can readily think back to the Spring of 1940. An invincible army stood behind an impregnable defense network, the Maginot Line. It was the largest, best-trained, finest-equipped military force in Europe, and it was considered by all military experts as a guarantee of security for France against all blows from the German forces. But what happened when the first blow came? Within a few weeks the political framework of France collapsed, and the military machine was ground to pieces with hardly a single major battle or a significant number of casualties. What had brought about such a debacle? To understand all the complex reasons why, and at the same time learn why the same thing could happen to us, it is highly recommended that you read "The Collapse of the Third Republic," by William L. Shirer. He has skillfully traced the roots of France's fall from greatness. Summed up briefly, it gives evidence of a nation so lacking in national will, so weakened by moral decay, and so divided within itself, that the soul of France had died. Germany did not win a military triumph, it was handed one.

Then in the summer of 1940 the scene shifted a few miles across the English Channel, where Great Britain stood alone, isolated, and almost unarmed, having abandoned its weapons on the beaches of Dunkerque. Britain's lifelines across the Atlantic and through the Mediterranean were under siege by the German U-boats, her cities were being pounded by the Luftwaffe almost daily, and her industrial machine was being destroyed. By every rational military standard Britain was already whipped, and further resistance seemed both futile and counter-productive. But the fierce pride in their heritage, the tenacity of its island people, the eloquent exhortations to "blood, sweat, toil, and tears" by Winston Churchill, motivated Britons to a strength and will that surpassed all understanding. In the battle of France, the once-great French nation had lost its soul. But only a few weeks later the Battle of Britain found the soul of that nation. To paraphrase Shakespeare the British taunt to German fury was: "Lay On!" And that defiance did not falter until final victory, five long years after their "darkest hour."

There is your study in contrasts—and the American nation has endured parallels to the British achievement of the 1940's. George Washington led a ragtail-army against the finest trained and equipped troops of the world's most powerful empire, in the American Revolution. Despite years of defeats, the desertion of thousands of troops, the betrayal by high commanders, the lack of basic resources and weapons, Washington's inspired leadership brought about the final victory and the creation of our national freedom. Then the founding fathers went to work to set up the "finest constitution ever framed by the hand of man" as Edmund Burke termed it. The basic premise of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution was that our freedoms are de-

rived from our Creator and not from men. Thomas Jefferson stated it in these words: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time". That recognition of the Almighty as the source of our basic rights is not only part of every great document of our heritage, it also appears in the writings of Washington, of Lincoln, of Dwight Eisenhower, and a host of other great national leaders.

The origins of our freedoms are extolled in our national hymn "America" which sings out its final verse:

"Our fathers God to Thee
Author of Liberty
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedoms holy light
Protect us by Thy might
Great God, our King."

Similar references to this nation "under God" are found in the National Anthem, in "America, the Beautiful", and in our Pledge of Allegiance. Who can doubt that this great tradition of freedom under God has shaped the character and fundamental essence of the soul of America?

It certainly shaped the determination of Abraham Lincoln to wipe out the institution of slavery, even at the cost of a great civil war. And it guided his thoughts for the reconciliation of the Republic after the torments of that war, a mission which he was never to carry out because of the assassin's bullet.

Despite the crimes of the Reconstruction era, the nation finally did overcome the bitterness and division to march forward to the new Promised Land. Yes, many of us are not far removed from other lands, but just as the Pilgrims in 1620 landed at Plymouth Rock seeking religious freedom and human dignity our forebears came to America in later years for those same goals. Their welcome to this land has been given from the base of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to be free. The wretched refuse of your teeming shore, send these; the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift the lamp beside the golden door."

All of those millions of immigrants have shaped the character and the soul of America. In the 20th century America not only became the refuge for so many oppressed, it also extended itself in two World Wars to liberate many other lands from the oppressor. And after both conflicts it put forth its bounty and wealth to restore and feed the war-ravaged lands, and even the nations whose armies had marched against us, Germany, Italy, Japan. That magnanimity, and willingness to forgive, sprang from the soul of America.

But great nations do not always remain constant in their loyalty to the national character that brought them to greatness. Witness the Roman Empire which lasted a thousand years as master of the known world. By its own internal moral decay and its inability to continue as a world leader, it collapsed under the blows of the barbarian hordes. The same fate has overtaken many other powerful nations and empires throughout history. Even in our own time we have witnessed the decline of great powers from their eminence. Can we regard the sad plight of Britain today as anything but a tragic contrast to the epic months of 1940 when "so many owed so much to so few?" Will the dictatorship of Marxism soon engulf France, Italy, Spain and Portugal? Will Canada toss away its national unity and its role as a model of democracy for small nations?

And if all those nations can lose their souls, what about the land we love? Can we continue to divide our country, class against

class, race against race, "haves" against "have-nots?" Can we recklessly fight for "liberation" of individual groups already free and equal by law? Can we seek ever higher scales of earnings without regard for economic productivity, inflationary consequences, and disastrous impact upon the body-politic? Can we demand an ever-increasing piece of an ever-diminishing pie? Can we fly in the face of the Creator by our ever-rising crime, corruption and moral decay? Will the blessings which this Republic has enjoyed be continued by a just God?

If we forget the sacrifices and labors that brought us to our present position, how long can our nation endure? Are the youth of our land ready to fight and even to die to preserve this great heritage? You can be certain that the youth of China, of Russia, of Cuba, of Vietnam, are ready to do so. How will we meet that challenge? We cannot wait for the blow to strike to frame our strategy. If our national will, our discipline and our courage are not plain to our foes, they will strike with a fury that this land has never felt before. We have to rediscover the greatness of America, find the soul of our nation, rekindle the torch of liberty, return to the things that shaped the national resolve in past crises.

When historians chronicle the record of these years, will their judgment be that America's decline from greatness started in our generation? Danger signs are all about us, and to continue on the present road is to "proceed at our own risk." How long can special interests or petty groups be allowed to force submission from the government by blackmail tactics, or violence, or economic anarchy? Government of the people must function for the common good not the private benefit of a minority. Our nation has lost much of the sense of community and neighborliness that gave life meaning and purpose in earlier years.

The courts have assumed a role never conceived by the founding fathers. Many of the ideals of majority rule with full consideration for minority rights, have been negated by the new powers assumed by the courts. They have made the schools of our land pawns in the struggles of segments of our society. And where the people who founded this nation certainly had put the Creator and His laws into the educational structure, the rule by courts has removed both. There is no longer reverence for a higher being, or a higher law, anywhere in our scheme of education. In fact there is hardly any real education left in the public schools. That is evident when academic illiterates are being graduated from high schools, and forced to be accepted in universities under quotas imposed by the courts.

All of these trends are causing the people to lose confidence in their government, to lose respect for their leaders, and to abstain from the governing process. So we are starting to forget Franklin's admonition: "a republic—if you can keep it!" The soul of our nation is at stake. When will we turn back from the road to our destruction? While we are faltering, America's foes are gathering strength. They witness our domestic torments, and delight in what they see. Are we counting on our "Maginot Line" to save us?

When the blow comes, will our disintegration be as rapid and as complete as the collapse of France? In the past few minutes many questions have been posed—the answers are not mine to give. They have to come from the national will, from the nation's soul, and from our firm reliance on the God of our Fathers. For the Book of Proverbs has told us:

"Righteousness exalteth a land, and sin is a reproach to its people." ●

CXXIV—641—Part 8

F. JOSEPH (JIGGS) DONOHUE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, F. Joseph (Jiggs) Donohue, the former president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for years a noted figure on the national political scene, passed away last week in his adopted city of Washington.

A native son of Massachusetts, he came to Washington after World War I to attend Catholic University, received his law degree, and later taught at the university's law school. He served as a special prosecutor for the Justice Department in the late 1940's and was Assistant Director in charge of enforcement in the Office of Price Stabilization during the Korean war.

President Harry S. Truman appointed him to the board of commissioners of the District of Columbia in 1951, and he served in that position with distinction and enthusiasm, fighting for racial tolerance, an end to segregated schools, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial in the Washington Post of April 6, 1978 in tribute to Jiggs Donohue:

F. JOSEPH (JIGGS) DONOHUE

Few partisan residents of this community look back with much fondness on the years when the District was entirely under the colonial thumb of Congress, with three presidentially appointed commissioners installed in city hall to mind the store as well as their municipal Ps and Qs. But if ever there was an exciting respite in the District Building back then, it was the two-year run of F. Joseph (Jiggs) Donohue as a commissioner and eventually as president of the board of commissioners. Mr. Donohue, who died here Tuesday at the age of 78, promptly won the hearts of Washingtonians with a nonstop barrage of blarney, boosterism and remarkably gutsy speeches in behalf of this city and its rightful desire for a measure of self-determination.

Mr. Donohue never was content to be a mere caretaker in the District Building. He plunged in quickly—making more than 400 speeches in his first year, initiating weekly radio and television reports to the people on the doings of government and encouraging citizen participation in their restricted local franchise. There was the time in February 1953, for example, when Mr. Donohue was sitting as a spectator at a session of the Senate District Committee, listening to members rattle off their ideas on how the city should be run. After they had finished, he was asked if he had anything to say. He proceeded to accuse Congress of "studied neglect" of the city, noting that the burden had become one that taxpayers could "no longer continue to endure."

Mr. Donohue also spoke bluntly to the Senators about the racial makeup of the city and its connection with the denial of voting rights here: "We look like Americans and dress like Americans. We pay taxes like Americans. When war comes we fight like Americans. But we have no rights as Americans either to vote for our local municipal officers,

or to vote for the president or vice president of the United States."

With characteristic fervor, Mr. Donohue campaigned for larger federal payments to the city, improved personnel procedures, an end to segregated schools, greater economics development and home rule. Though his interest in home rule later turned to opposition, he will be remembered most for his stout devotion to the city at a time when it counted a great deal—and for bringing to the District Building the vitality it needed to press on for better local government. ●

DOUBLE STANDARD ON HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned over the apparent double standard which the Carter administration is applying toward the various Third World countries. In particular, I find the administration's human rights policy vis-a-vis the various Marxist dictatorships in Africa to be wholly inconsistent with its actions toward Brazil, Chile, the Philippines, and South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial by Messrs. Evans and Novak which deals with the Carter administration's human rights policies.

The editorial follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The state of Jimmy Carter's global human-rights campaign in its second year was reflected on his recent visit to Nigeria. There a vague, supercautious intimation that even African nations sometimes abuse their citizens was barely kept in his speech.

The original version of Carter's April 1 speech in Lagos contained a more candid statement opposing human-rights violations in Africa. But Richard Moose, assistant secretary of state for African affairs, fought to get it out. Presidential speechwriter James Fallows fought back, and the result was a watered-down compromise.

No such caution was shown at the President's previous stop in Brazil, which, like Nigeria, is under military rule. Carter did not hesitate to mention human-rights differences with the Brazilians and conferred with Roman Catholic Cardinal Paul Arns, a liberal dissenter against the regime.

The contrast is no accident. After early anti-Soviet emphasis, the Carter human-rights crusade has taken this peculiar course: While pulling no punches in assailing anti-communist dictatorships for their human-rights transgressions, Washington often looks the other way at abuses by neutralist dictatorships—particularly in black Africa.

That fits the global strategy charted by ideological young policymakers at the State Department but offends other liberals in the administration. "It gets hypocritical when we're attacking Brazil and Chile but close our eyes to human-rights violations in Africa," one presidential aide told us.

He and others did not believe Carter should ignore such violations on a continent where there is mass murder in Uganda, slave labor in Equatorial Guinea, political repression in a dozen other countries and freedom almost nowhere. So the draft of his Lagos speech contained a statement that, without men-

tioning Uganda or any other country by name, condemned what goes on.

But that violated the policy, sculpted by Moose and U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, of courting black Africa at any price (including rejection of moderate biracial solutions in southern Africa). Moose contended that single statement would doom the president in Africa.

That's when speechwriter Fallows, a liberal young journalist from Texas, stepped in. There were reports he threatened to resign, though well-informed presidential aides tell us it never got that far. He finally managed to get these two watery sentences through Moose's censorship: "Our concern for human rights extends throughout this continent and throughout the world. Whatever [the] ideology or the power or the race of a government that abuses the rights of its people, we oppose those abuses." No names mentioned, of course.

The Moose-Fallows clash was fought without appeal to Carter, but the president himself is not immune. On April 2, he admitted to a press conference he had not mentioned Uganda's egregious Gen. Idi Amin or his anti-human-rights outrages to Lt. Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria's chief of state.

The president next declared "gratitude" that "the organization of African states" has condemned "black leaders" who "deprive persons of human rights." In fact, last year's meeting of the Organization of African Unity, which we attended, lionized Idi Amin and issued not one word of criticism against atrocities in Uganda or anywhere on the continent.

Carter wound up equating the United States and Nigeria in making "every effort to enhance human rights." Actually, non-ideological Freedom House calls Nigeria "partly free" and gives it a 5 rating in political rights out of a worst possible 7 (worse than Brazil's 4). The president was comparing the U.S. to a country where public executions are held, where American newsmen are excluded and where military rule still prevails.

Why that extraordinary treatment for Nigeria? One cynical, high-ranking U.S. official says there is a "three-letter answer": oil. But far more important than dependence on Nigeria as the second-largest oil supplier of the United States is its supposed leadership role in black Africa. If Nigeria wants to talk about the Cuban expeditionary force or black African repression, that is not viewed by Young, Moose & Co. as too large a price for friendship.

That actually supports the traditionalist view that foreign policy cannot be based strictly on human-rights performance. But why a double standard for leftist black Africa and rightish Latin America? Since it is hard to argue enlightened self-interest, the suspicion arises that ideological preferences at certain levels of the State Department now shape foreign policy, just as they did the speech at Lagos. ●

DEATH OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN J. HARDIN PETERSON, SR.

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join with my colleagues from Florida in their sadness over the death of former Congressman J. Hardin Peterson, Sr.

Congressman Peterson represented the central west coast area of Florida for 18

years, spanning the time through the Great Depression and World War II. As chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, Mr. Peterson initiated the creation of the Everglades National Park, which has proved to be of immeasurable enjoyment not only to Floridians, but to all Americans.

Peterson also served as special counsel to the Territory of Guam; special counsel for the West Coast Inland Navigation District; and county solicitor and prosecuting attorney for Polk County.

He had also served as city attorney for the cities of Lakeland, Lake Wales, Frostproof, Hillcrest Heights, and Highland Park, Fla.

When he died, he left a wife, two children, grandchildren, and a record of long and devoted service to society.

The following article is a typical example of the esteem in which he was held in the area in which he served:

J. HARDIN PETERSON

The day J. Hardin Peterson died, the New York Times ran a major story on the strides Florida has made in protecting the environment.

Those two events Tuesday amount to something of an eerie coincidence—for Peterson was a recognized Florida environmentalist back in the days when that word wasn't in the dictionary.

James Hardin Peterson Sr. left Lakeland for Washington in 1933. He had just been elected Polk County's congressman in the U.S. House of Representatives. In those days, this was one of the country's largest congressional districts, stretching from Marion County in North Florida to the Dade County line in South Florida.

Polk County was no stranger to the halls of Congress when Peterson arrived. Herbert J. Drane of Lakeland—the man Peterson defeated by a mere 117 votes—had been a Congressman since 1917. Park Trammell of Lakeland, who had previously been governor, was serving as a United States senator.

Those were difficult times for the republic in '33. The depression was at its worst; banks were closing, the unemployed were standing in breadlines, and there was widespread despair that this country might never recover from its economic paralysis.

Under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's leadership, Peterson had a hand in shaping the eventual recovery from the depression—a feat in itself. But his singular achievement was the creation of the Everglades National Park, which had its beginnings in the House Public Lands Committee under Peterson's chairmanship. For his efforts on behalf of Florida's environment, he received a citation from the National Audubon Society, a Florida Wildlife Conservation Award, and was honored by the National Conference of State Parks.

Environment wasn't his only interest. He was a member of the House-Senate conference committee which drafted the GI Bill of Rights. He was a trustee of the National Trust of Historical Preservation, was board chairman of the Florida Heart Association, and served as special counsel to the Territory of Guam. Upon returning to Lakeland, he was involved in a myriad of civic pursuits.

During his later years, in his frequent addresses to local organizations, he would tell an opening story: "They've been recently repairing me. I have cataracts in one eye and have recently acquired a hearing aid. A few minutes ago the battery went out. But I was able to hear my introduction as a 'great statesman'."

To some, Peterson may have been a "great statesman." To others, he was merely

a hard-working lawyer who served this district well in Congress for 18 years; who served his community for years thereafter.

When he died Tuesday, at the age of 84, he left what many men leave, a wife, children and grandchildren, and what most men don't leave—a record of service to his fellow humans.

But in leaving the Everglades National Park, J. Hardin Peterson belongs in the elite class which has given a lasting gift to generations to come. ●

ONE OF AVIATION'S REAL PAPPYS

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the many friends of Pappy Spinks in wishing him a very happy 72d birthday.

Pappy is one of our Nation's true pioneers in Aviation and one of the most fascinating and colorful aviators I know. A self-taught pilot and present owner of the Oak Grove Airport, Pappy has been flying airplanes since he was 16.

I share Pappy's interest in flying and building airplanes. I too have built my own airplane and can appreciate the success and satisfaction he must have felt as a teenage boy learning to fly an airplane he himself had built.

From his early barnstorming years in 1923, he has enjoyed an exciting career as an aviator. I place this article written by Barbara Holsomback of the Fort Worth Star Telegram in the RECORD at this point:

EARLY BARNSTORMING YEARS SHAPED FW AVIATOR'S CAREER

(Editor's note: This is "Pappy" Spinks' 72nd birthday. He was given a surprise party Sunday at Oak Grove Airport attended by friends from throughout the country. A helicopter towed a sign reading "Happy Birthday, Pappy" and he had a cake shaped like the airplane.)

M. H. "Pappy" Spinks Sr. has a sign in his office at Oak Grove Airport that reads, "God does not deduct from man's allotted time the hours spent flying."

If God did, Spinks would have discovered the fountain of youth because he's been flying since 1922 when he was 16. It was that year Spinks soloed in the plane he built from junk parts of a Curtis Wright JN-4D (Jenny).

The wealthy Fort Worth aviator has had a flamboyance for controversy from the time he started smoking cigarettes at six until recently when the training of Ugandan pilots at his airport put him in the national spotlight.

Spinks got his first look at an airplane when pioneer aviator Cal Rogers landed his plane at a Fort Worth airport during a publicity tour for a soft drink company.

"When I saw the plane I ran to the airport," Spinks said. "My mother and father came after me in their horse and buggy. That day I told (my parents) I was going to be an airplane driver."

At the close of World War I, Spinks bought all the surplus airplane parts he could find, but there were not enough to construct a complete airplane. Undaunted, he obtained "Jenny" drawings from U.S. Army. "I won't say I got them legally or illegally," he said.

He started making plans to build an airplane half the size of a standard Jenny. His junior high school teacher let him work on the modifications in mechanical drawing class.

"I was learning far more from that than following the regular curriculum," he said. "All my life I was an extremely curious person, but never a good student. They (the teachers) went too slow for me."

While he was completing the airplane drawings he was "constructing the thing" at home in his barn. Spinks used hand tools and equipment he borrowed from school to shape exotic woods into the parts he was not able to get from the Army.

"My father objected (to the project), but my mother was for it and was my helper," he said. It took him one full year to finish. "After the plane was completed, my father put the wings in the hayloft and forbid me to use them."

But his father's efforts to stall his flying dreams were only successful for several months. At that time there were no manuals on flying. The Army provided the only schools. So Spinks started learning to fly by trial and error.

"I'd taxi the airplane around every weekend, after school or any time I wasn't in school. This went on until I'd flown the plane 200 hours. If I didn't have any money for gas, I'd drain some out of the cars at home."

Finally on a fall day in 1922 Spinks soloed 50 feet above the ground. He had not intended to fly so high, but lifted the plane skyward to avoid a fence, trees and houses. "I made a low circle and slowly descended to a landing," he said. "Once I got within a few feet of the ground I was in home territory because that's where I'd been flying all those months."

The teenager continued his flying until he tore up a wing by crashing into a car. "I never rebuilt it (the Jenny)," Spinks said. "But from that time until now I've never been without an airplane. I've been without an auto and food, but not an airplane."

At 17 he went into business at Aviation Gardens where he and his partners joined a growing number of barnstormers.

"We charged people \$5 a head to take them for a ride, \$2 if it was hard times," he said. "We'd cram two into an airplane at a time."

From then until World War II Spinks "worked all kinds of jobs," usually two or three at once. He purchased his first "modern aircraft," a Curtis Wright Pusher, in 1935 and was required by the Civil Aeronautics Administration to demonstrate his solo ability under the direction of a flight instructor.

It was in that airplane he hunted chicken hawks for ranchers around Abilene. "I charged a \$1 bounty for each chicken hawk I shot with a shotgun," Spinks said. "When I'd shoot one I'd throw a yellow ribbon, tied to a rock, over the side of the plane. The ranchers counted the ribbons to see how much they owed me."

During World War II he taught aviation cadets to fly as a civilian instructor for the U.S. Army Corp civilian contract school. "I was too old to join the Army," Spinks said. "I never completed college, but I have passed tests to teach in universities."

He did just that during the war when he joined the physics department faculty at TCU. Through the years, Spinks' reputation has grown in the aviation field and he stopped counting flying hours at 5,000.

In 1966, when he was 60, he became interested in aerobatics. "Aerobatics is the operation of an aircraft with high precision and at unusual altitudes," he said. "This is not an air show, but the pilot is graded on his ability to control the aircraft during predetermined maneuvers."

"I joined the Aerobatics Club of America

when the U.S. Aerobatics Team was always down at the bottom in world competition. I got tired of us being the hindmost."

Within four years he became president of the aerobatics club and saw the U.S. team capture the world Aerobatic Championship, largely due to his efforts and after he built the Spinks Akromaster, a low-wing monoplane used in the aerobatics competition.

Today the father of a six-year-old son said, "I'm ready to retire." But if the number of phone calls coming into his office on the day he was interviewed by a Star-Telegram reporter is any indication, Spinks hasn't slowed down too much.

He not only owns Oak Grove Airport, but is chairman of the board of Spinks Industries.

"Crazy about the TV show 'Saturday Night Live,'" Spinks tapes each of those shows, works out in his gymnasium and has "really a little doctor's office" near his home. "These are my hobbies," he said. ●

COLUMNIST DISCUSSES MINNESOTA'S RECREATION AREA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area is currently the most widely discussed and controversial issue in my home State of Minnesota.

I expect that this House will shortly consider legislation providing for the future management of the area.

Outdoors Editor Hank Kehborn of the St. Paul Pioneer Press devoted his column last Sunday, April 9, 1978, to an analysis of the controversy and its impact on the people I represent in this House.

Hank's column is one of the best journalistic analyses of the issue I have seen. It expresses the sentiments of Minnesotans and of other Americans whose ways of life, economic welfare, and recreational opportunities are threatened by what Hank calls "absentee environmentalists and an absentee landlord—Uncle Whiskers."

The impact of eliminating current summer and winter recreational use of the BWCA will be enormous in both monetary and human costs. The additional layer of bureaucracy contained in legislation initially approved by a House subcommittee last week would impose an intolerable and unnecessary yoke on the people of the area.

Kehborn does not attempt to analyze the monetary cost, but he does offer an unusually sensitive understanding of the effect of this legislation on people. In that spirit, I commend Hank Kehborn's column to my colleagues:

ABSENTEES CALL SHOTS ON BWCA

If you have been following the Boundary Waters Canoe Area (BWCA) issue, it must be apparent by now northern Minnesotans don't know from borscht when it comes to wilderness areas.

It is obvious "wiser" heads prevail in such wilderness areas as the concrete canyons of New York City, Washington, D.C., St. Paul and Minneapolis and even Los Angeles.

Like it or not, the recreational future of

the BWCA is in the hands of absentee environmentalists and an absentee landlord—Uncle Whiskers.

Like a doting parent, the absentees are determined to dictate the life-styles of residents, and visitors, to a 1,030,000 area of Minnesota which contains some 1,076 lakes and 1,200 miles of canoe routes.

Led by such veterans of the wilderness as Rep. Bruce Vento of St. Paul, Rep. Donald Fraser of Minneapolis and Rep. Phillip Burton of California, the absentees envision a private playground for the young of heart and strong of back.

This protectionist attitude eliminates the BWCA (Ban Woman, Children, Adults) from usage by the handicapped, the very young the aged and the weekend user.

There is no need to go into the economic impact.

That is for those who labor on the financial pages. However, it would be safe to say if protectionists have their way the BWCA will become an attraction as the nation's first wilderness ghetto.

It will become an isolated island despite Congressional hot air which promises a golden age because of compromise and promises of peripheral or portal privileges.

There is no such thing as compromise. It is a word often bandied about by politicians who suddenly find themselves on the hot seat.

The feeling is Burton-Vento-Fraser are very confused, not only about what wilderness is, but also about what Americans want in the way of outdoor recreational opportunity.

They seem to be unaware that designating lands as federal wilderness areas, and then filling the cup until it runneth over with restrictions, will not really increase the type of recreation they seem to seek.

Class legislation, opening the BWCA to young bucks with 75 pound packs and a canoe to match while shutting off all motors and closing resorts and homes, apparently is the answer to whatever these asphalt dwellers seek.

Yet, and this most certainly must hold true for the Burton-Vento-Fraser triumvirate, the word "wilderness" conjures up visions of virtually everything but true wilderness.

To many, Yellowstone National Park is a "true wilderness" despite the fact it does not fit any of the criteria for such a designation.

To be honest, most Americans are also confused, not only about what a wilderness is, but also about what most want when it comes to recreation.

The BWCA, left as it is, serves a purpose, for a wilderness is whatever an individual believes it is—an area which offers an opportunity to get away from the rat race.

To restrict this area to a "chosen few" because they are blessed with strong backs and sturdy legs is to deny the equal rights of thousands upon thousands of others less fortunate.

To many of us there was a time when a sojourn into BWCA country, laden with pack and canoe, presented no problem. It was a time when "living off the land" was a rugged and enjoyable challenge.

However, as the forest ages so do its inhabitants. The challenge is no longer attainable for some inhabitants. The forest, to be enjoyed, is still attainable.

But is it?

A visit to the BWCA today, because of the many restrictions, demands the use of a Philadelphia lawyer as a guide.

The one-time visitor is faced with a "long-term reservation system," filled-up entry points and disappointment during holiday weekends or more popular months of summer.

Perhaps that is as it should be. Control is the name of the game whenever Uncle Whiskers steps in to run the store.

However, it is time Uncle Whiskers and his clerks quit listening to powerful absentee environmentalists and permitted the local help to run the business—at least to some degree.

It is time to quit thinking total protection and give more thought to multiple use which will provide commercial and recreational opportunities compatible with wise land management.

Preservationists want all logging and mining stopped, all motors (outboard and snowmobile) banned, all resorts and homes closed and all hunting halted.

Wiser, but not much wiser, heads have prevailed but only to the extent political reprisal lurks in the shadows.

There is no argument mining is compatible. It is not. It should be banned.

Outboard motors or snowmobiles?

Perhaps my hearing isn't what it used to be, but even in my younger days I cannot recall the sound of an engine, even on the most remote lake in the BWCA, ever shattering my serenity or whatever it was I was seeking back in the boonies.

Logging?

Preservationists are spouting a philosophy that favors natural processes, unaltered by man, to be superior to wise management, failing to recognize trees must be harvested for the benefit of man and wildlife.

Just how logging is to be controlled is open to debate but it is obvious to all but the preservationist we must retain variety and diversity and use our forests for the benefit of all.

Preservationists see nothing wrong with trees dying of old age or disease, or even being consumed by fire—as long as the tree's demise is by natural forces.

Some have even gone to the extreme of advocating natural fires be allowed to burn through thousands of acres of the BWCA without any attempt to stop it.

This, they say, is nature's way.

That may have been so when Columbus hit the beach but it would hardly be wise management today.

Although I may be persuaded to listen to arguments concerning commercial logging with its profit motivation, there is no reconciling another aspect of forest management—the perpetuation of habitat needed to sustain wildlife native to the BWCA.

There is universal agreement (except by preservationists) that deer cannot survive in a forest environment comprised mostly of old trees, where food has grown out of reach and a canopy prevents sunlight from reaching the forest ground to nurture young trees.

Obviously, preservationists do not fully comprehend what happens to the land—and the forests—and are unknowingly setting up a conflict which will ultimately destroy the things they profess to love most.

Regardless of what they preach, multiple-use management of the BWCA provides for recreational use and encourages wildlife habitat improvement, resulting in a happy marriage and a wise use of the environment.

Perhaps it is time our august legislators took a long, hard look at absentee environmentalists and their plans for Minnesota.

Minnesotans today—through the dictates of Uncle Whiskers' agents in that mausoleum called Congress—are already telling us where we can or cannot hunt ducks, harvest wild rice and even where to fish or not to fish.

It is even being suggested it is wrong to fish and hunt in wilderness areas because it "upsets the natural ecosystem."

The only thing this whole mess upsets is my stomach.

Don't write to me. Write to your Congressman. ●

FOOD, DRUG TESTS BECOME A BITTER PILL

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned that the food we eat, the medicines we use, and the substances we come in contact with, be free from hazardous side effects.

Yet, in determining what materials are safe, and which are not, the Federal Government has constructed a maze of regulatory agencies, which produce quite often, conflicting or contradictory conclusions.

Until uniform, responsible and realistic testing procedures are established, the public will continue to look in bewilderment at all the conflicting data available on the food, medicines and household products that all must use.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of a Los Angeles Times article, "Food, Drug Tests Become a Bitter Pill." American industry has come a long way since the day when Theodore Roosevelt, after reading Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle," fought for the first pure food and drug laws. The responsibility for marketing safe products must not be lost in a maze of procedures.

FOOD, DRUG TESTS BECOME A BITTER PILL

(By Robert C. Toth)

WASHINGTON.—The American public shows signs of becoming as exasperated as the old Irish woman whose doctor took away one after another of her pleasures until she exploded: "Soon ye'll be taking away me dying!"

Saccharin, hair dye, cured meats like bacon, even drinking water have been cited within the last year as causes of cancer—at least cancer in small animals fed large doses of suspect chemicals.

The presumption is that these chemicals also cause cancer in humans when taken in normal doses. But there are two tenuous steps in that reasoning—going from large to small doses, and from lower to higher species. Moreover, the test animals used usually are chosen because they are cancer-prone.

But acting on presumption, government regulators move to ban or restrict such chemicals. The public—seeing familiar products taken off their tables or out of their medicine cabinets and being unpersuaded at best by the evidence—appears to have become increasingly skeptical and incredulous, particularly when test results and government actions cost consumers money and increase their anxiety, or worse.

Some horror stories:

In 1972 children's sleepwear was ordered treated with flame-retardant chemicals, raising sleepwear prices 20%. Last year the chemicals were banned because they can be absorbed through the skin and cause cancer.

Certain spray adhesives were banned when a researcher reported that their use by pregnant women could cause birth defects in babies. Seven months later the ban was rescinded. But in those seven months, some doctors said they recommended abortions to exposed women who were worried.

Two testing laboratories and a drug company were found to have distorted, even invented, test results. This "creative penman-

ship" included reporting that a larger number of animals were tested than actually were. Sometimes tests were designed to hide, rather than find, dangerous side effects of a drug or pesticide, according to reports to Congress by the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The first alarm of this kind, the Great Cranberry Scare of 1959, was blamed on the pesticide, amitrole, whose cancer-causing ability is still unproven, according to Edward W. Lawless, author of "Technology and Social Shock."

"The major evidence (of carcinogenicity) is still a footnote in a preliminary report of a study," he writes, and is "still controversial."

There is no undisputed case in which a chemical was found to cause cancer in test animals and, when exposed human groups were examined, also was found to cause cancer in man. Saccharin may become the first if a recently announced \$1.4 million 18-month study finds a correlation between bladder cancer and the sweetener's use. Several smaller-scale studies on man have been equivocal.

Observers, in and out of government, claim that the government's "bear-hug of protection" has become so stifling that reaction has set in. If so, that might help explain the defeat last week in the House of Representatives of a bill to create a new Consumer Protection Agency, atop the 33 existing agencies that have among them about 1,000 consumer-oriented programs.

Three years ago, Rep. John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) supported the measure, but last week voted against it. "The grass roots doesn't want it," he said. "They regard the government as a faceless bureaucratic intrusion in their lives."

Even the regulators admit they are in trouble. "There is a crisis of confidence in testing procedures and in regulation as well," said Dr. Donald Kennedy, the new commissioner of food and drugs.

Skepticism extends beyond the public into the ranks of experts. Dr. Emil M. Mrak, Chancellor Emeritus at UC Davis and an authority on food chemistry, was said to have bought huge jars of saccharin when the FDA moved against it so he would have an uninterrupted supply.

"Not true," Mrak said in a telephone interview. "I did that with cyclamate, the earlier sweetener, when FDA banned it in 1970. But I would have done it with saccharin, too."

Once a radical, Mrak is now viewed as a conservative in the field. He was among the first to urge tests on at least two different animal species, rather than just one, before a chemical or drug could be labeled safe for humans.

This concept was finally accepted "but now they call me an industry man because I think things have gone too far," Mrak said.

"We should apply more common sense in these cases, a better weighing of risks and benefits, fewer outright bans and more warning labels, perhaps."

Mrak and others believe there are thresholds below which chemicals do no damage or that any such damage is quickly repaired. But the government, partly because of the way the laws are written, operates as if there was no safety threshold.

Mrak also objects to testing with massive doses of chemicals and then extrapolating down to low dosages, as in the saccharin tests. In those tests, rats were fed diets consisting of 5 percent saccharin, a huge amount comparable to a man drinking 800 bottles of diet soda a day.

"You upset the whole metabolic process of the animal and weaken it with such doses," Mrak said. "It's almost bound to have some adverse effect."

FDA officials insist that large doses alone will not cause cancer in animals. Large doses may poison it but will not cause the genetic changes inside cells that are characteristic of cancer, according to several studies.

A test of 120 pesticides and industrial chemicals given to mice in large doses found that only 11 caused tumors, according to FDA science director Richard Bates. "And these chemicals were not randomly 'selected,'" he emphasized. "The majority were picked (for testing) because they were already suspected of causing cancer."

Officials like Bates approach their regulatory responsibilities by seeking the most valid and practical scientific tests as the basis for their action.

To regulate the risks of food additives, drugs and environmental pollutants for humans, the most valid tests would be those done on humans. This is impossible for ethical reasons, but it also is impractical. Cancer takes as long as 40 years to show up. Many people might be dead from other causes before tests bore results.

Large primates like chimpanzees, even dogs and cats, would be next most suitable. But they cost too much to be fed and housed for their lifetimes.

So researchers favor rats, mice, hamsters and other small, short-lived, easily managed creatures that can be inbred to be genetically identical, generation after generation.

Still, it costs on average \$750 to \$1,000 per rodent per study. Each study requires at least 200 animals—half receive the chemical, half get identical treatment except no chemicals—and a full study costs at least \$150,000. Hundreds, perhaps thousands of such studies are conducted each year.

To further cut costs, large doses of the chemicals are used rather than small natural occurring doses. With small doses, many thousands of animals would be needed to find one case of cancer. With saccharin, for example, 180,000 rats would have to be fed at a dose level comparable to one diet soda a day—rather than at the 800-a-day level of the test—to find one animal with bladder cancer.

And to increase the chances of finding carcinogens, the experiments use animals with a high natural cancer rate. (To use normal animals would risk missing a carcinogen, researchers say.) Such animals usually are prone to cancer in only certain organs, however, and are used for tests of chemicals that are suspected of causing cancer in other organs.

Thus, the National Cancer Institute's favorite mouse strain, B6C3F1, has an average spontaneous tumor rate of 15 percent in the liver of male animals. It would be used to test a chemical suspected of causing stomach cancer, and so forth.

The average natural cancer rate can vary greatly, however, according to Dr. Cipriano Cucto, a Cancer Institute toxicologist: The B6C3F1 mouse, with the 15 percent average, had shown a 55 percent spontaneous tumor rate at one time, he said. It is almost as if the strains are so highly inbred that they get cancer if looked at cross-eyed, he acknowledged.

Mathematics, however, compensate for using cancer-prone animals—or so it is believed. To obtain a real rather than chance result, statisticians insist that a test be 95 percent reliable—which means if it was repeated 100 times, the result would be the same 95 of those times.

This standard is very demanding. Consider test groups of 50 animals each. If three animals in the control group get cancer naturally, eleven in the group receiving the chemical must get cancer for the test result to be considered significant and real. Ten tumorous animals are not enough in this case. Obviously, much rides on whether one

or two animals, more or less, get cancer out of a rather small test population.

Regulators would like to have more evidence than that on which to base policy decisions affecting hundreds of millions of people. If not more evidence, they would like more assurance that the evidence they have is valid.

To this end, at a former germ warfare arsenal in the rolling hills south of Little Rock, Ark., the National Center for Toxicological Research is completing a five-year, multimillion-dollar study to determine whether scientists can extrapolate from large to small doses, can use small test populations of animals and answer a host of other questions about testing procedures that disturb researchers as well as the public.

The center jokes about being "the biggest mouse factory in the world," and outside scientists refer to the study as a "mega-mouse"—meaning million-mouse—test. In fact, precisely 24,192 mice have been used, divided into 60 different groups of animals fed varying amounts of a chemical and sacrificed for examination over various periods up to a lifetime.

"It was the largest test ever done on dose-response relationships," Dr. C. D. Jackson, director of the Center's carcinogenesis division, said in an interview. "We looked at how soon tumors developed, whether we could sacrifice the animals early or had to let them live out their lives, and so on." Test results are expected later this year.

The center also is seeking other systems in which to test for chemicals that cause cancer, genetic changes, and birth defects. One possibility is a cell mixture which will undergo mutagenesis—genetic changes—in test-tube conditions. If it works, it could eliminate much of the costly animal testing.

But toxicology today is an imprecise science, and the suspicion is that politicians have been oversold, perhaps by themselves, on using it as the basis for regulating food additives, drugs, cosmetics, environmental pollutants and other chemicals affecting man.

Different chemicals are toxic to different degrees. Some are stronger carcinogens than others. Some endanger larger populations than others.

Saccharin is a weak carcinogen and if only a small population was exposed (say diabetics), the FDA would have had even a harder time explaining its action against the chemical sweetener.

Yet as the law is now written, the FDA has no authority to take into account the degree of risk or any countervailing benefit. The so-called Delaney Clause, added to the FDA's charter in 1958, states that "no (food) additive shall be deemed safe . . . if it is found . . . to induce cancer in man or animal."

"We are in a dilemma," acknowledged Steven D. Jellinek, assistant Environmental Protection Agency administrator for toxic substances. "We are at the cutting edge of science."

"If we wait 20 years for better test systems, lots of people may suffer. So we must act on the very inadequate science of the day, with the very inadequate statistics, to make the best decision we can on the evidence we've got at the time."

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS B. BERGNA

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor

Mr. Louis P. Bergna, district attorney for Santa Clara County, who was honored with a testimonial dinner on April 12, 1978, by City of Hope, a private organization that conducts medical research on childhood diseases.

Lou is a native Californian. He received his undergraduate degree from Stanford University and his Juris Doctorate from the University of Santa Clara. After passing the bar in 1948, he went to work for the district attorney's office as a deputy and was appointed chief trial attorney in 1951. He returned to private practice in 1952 until he was appointed district attorney for Santa Clara County in September 1957.

In addition to his service as district attorney, Lou was an assistant professor at San Jose State University police school from 1949 to 1969. He represented California on President Kennedy's White House Conference on Narcotics and he was appointed by Governor Reagan to serve on the California Council on Criminal Justice in 1968. He is past president of the Santa Clara Bar Association and the California District Attorneys Association. During 1975-76 he was president of the National District Attorneys Association and is still an active member of that organization. He currently serves on the Regional Justice Planning Board. Lou has been honored with the National District Attorneys Distinguished Service Award and the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award. And on April 12, 1978, Lou Bergna was awarded the Spirit of Life Award from City of Hope.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all my colleagues to join with me to say congratulations Louis P. Bergna for all his fine work. His contributions over the years have helped to make our valley a better place to live.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, this is a season of jubilant celebration in the city of Alhambra which is located in the beautiful valley of San Gabriel in the Golden State of California. The people of Alhambra are observing the 75th Anniversary of their city's incorporation. It gives me great pride and joy as the elected representative of California's 26th Congressional District which includes the city of Alhambra to offer this tribute to a sturdy city which has, through private enterprise, grown from a small community of 600 residents 75 years ago to a thriving, important municipality with a population of more than 62,000 people within the city limits. The mayor of Alhambra, Hon. J. Parker Williams, and other civil leaders have set up the Alhambra Diamond Anniversary Committee under which several community activities are scheduled where the notable event of the incorporation of the city of Alhambra will be officially recog-

nized. The members of the Alhambra Diamond Anniversary Committee are: Mayor Parker, former mayor and city councilman Steve Ballreich, executive manager of the chamber of commerce Jackson B. Kuehnle, Alhambra Community Hospital Administrator David Jacobson, Alhambra Post Advocate editor and publisher Warner Jenkins, Alhambra central business district manager Richard Nichols, and businessman Pete Letourneau. The first event will be on April 22 when the Alhambra Jaycees will sponsor the annual Hi Neighbor Day Parade. Luis Brambila is chairman of this 34th annual parade, and George Ramos is general chairman and international vice president of the Alhambra Jaycees. I am honored to participate in this event and on this occasion I will present this insert from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD noting that I have made the celebration of this significant event a permanent part of the record of the U.S. Congress. On July 11 the Historical Society of Alhambra will have a mock period dress celebration on the date of this city's incorporation. On September 24 the city will hold a community picnic with fireworks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following information about the history of Alhambra, the city called the Gateway to the San Gabriel Valley, as it appears in a publication distributed by the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce:

The principal part of the land within Alhambra's present boundaries was included in the 1771 grant made to Mission San Gabriel, five years before the birth of our Nation. There were no orchards or vineyards in the San Gabriel Valley then, only dry, uncultivated fields broken by arroyos and low-lying hills from the Mission San Gabriel west to the small Indian village called "Yang-na," which later became Los Angeles. According to 1784 records of individual land grants made by the Spanish Government, at least a portion of the land on which Alhambra was built was once part of 300,000 acres grant to Manuel Nieto.

One of the early founders was Benjamin B. Wilson, a 29-year old Tennessean who later held several political offices and became a State Senator. "Don Benito," as he was familiarly called, married Ramona Yorba. Don Benito's eldest daughter, Maria, married a young engineer from Baltimore, James de Barth Shorb, and they were given a section of land adjoining the Wilson property as a wedding present. Shorb called in "San Marino," the name of his boyhood home in Maryland. The Huntington Library Art Gallery stands on the side of the Shorb home. Don Benito's wife died and he later married a widow, Mrs. Margaret Hereford, and this is significant because they had four children, one of which was Ruth Wilson who became Mrs. George Patton, mother of the famous General George Patton, Jr. In 1874 Don Benito bought the land between the Arroyo and the Old Mill Wash paying the State \$2.50 an acre. He divided the tract into five and ten acre lots. Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Shorb who had been reading *Alhambra*, Washington Irving's book of the legend of the Moorish Palace in Spain, suggested that Wilson name his venture "The Alhambra" because it was so romantic. There were several other subdivisions of property, some of which bear names from Don Benito's family, one of which is Mount Wilson where the Observatory is located.

No better description has been given of Alhambra than that of Rufus Fiske Bishop

who recalled on the 50th Anniversary of his arrival in the 1880's that "within what are now the city limits, there was not a schoolhouse, a store or a blacksmith shop. We saw a valley, wide and open, yellow with stubble, shimmering in the summer haze to the eastward, stretching from the blue mountains to the brown hills, with here and there a green splotch of young orchards and vineyard toward Pasadena or the foothills. That first spring we marvelled to see the slope (Altadena) ablaze with poppies and were told that ships steered their course by the bright color."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other colleagues in the House of Representatives join with me to offer our congratulations to the city of Alhambra on the occasion of their 75th anniversary.●

CRIMINAL CODE REFORM ACT STILL WRONG

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, serious threats to the fundamental rights of Americans are contained in legislation now being considered by a House subcommittee. Known as the Criminal Code Reform Act, this legislation (S. 1437/H.R. 6869) would greatly expand the Federal criminal law and would also undermine civil liberties protections established in the Bill of Rights.

I have previously introduced a resolution (H. Res. 10666) urging the Judiciary Committee to disapprove H.R. 6869 and to undertake a careful and thorough study of criminal code revision.

An editorial appearing in the February 20 Syracuse, N.Y., Herald-Journal incisively explains some of the principal problems with the legislation and it urges the House to examine the bill "with a fine-tooth comb and eliminate every provision that would in any way infringe on the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans."

I wholly concur with the Herald-Journal's position on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to study the paper's editorial which is reprinted below:

CODE STILL WRONG

After 12 years of writing and rewriting the legislation, and two earlier failures, the Senate finally passed the latest version of the Federal Criminal Code Reform Act.

The bill now is being considered by the House of Representatives.

It should not have gotten past the Senate. It must not be passed by the House.

The need for revision and organization of our federal criminal code was never in doubt. Back in the Lyndon Johnson administration, the National Commission on the Revision of the Federal Criminal Law began its task—with "liberal" goals in mind.

During the "law and order" days of the Nixon administration, the commission reversed direction and the resulting legislation, which came to be known simply as S1, was so repressive it was allowed to die a quiet death in committee.

But the seeds for reform had been planted. Supporters of the bill put their heads together to produce a compromise measure, discarding the most offensive sections. But they didn't go far enough.

As it stands now the legislation (HR6869) puts dangerously subjective powers in the hands of federal law enforcement officials and could silence the voice of popular dissent.

And even though some of the bill's harshest provisions were extracted on its way to passage in the Senate, the new code still contains a number of hedges against the First Amendment right to a free press.

For instance, it would allow the government to hold a reporter in criminal contempt for refusing to disclose confidential news sources, even under an order subsequently ruled invalid.

The code, as now written, also would authorize the government to prosecute a news reporter for hiding his notes in an effort to protect the identity of a confidential news source suspected of committing a crime.

HR6869 is stacked heavily against political expression through assemblies, demonstrations and picketing.

Section 1861 (Public Safety) would make it unlawful to disobey an order of a law enforcement officer or a public servant assigned public safety responsibilities where the order is issued in response to a fire, flood or riot. OK, so far. But the law also would extend to any "other condition that creates a risk of serious injury to a person or serious damage to property."

The phrase, "other condition," would put into the hands of every federal law enforcement official the authority to disperse any assembly, parade or picket line—anywhere in the U.S.

There are other provisions which, in the wrong hands, could be used to stifle dissent and should be considered serious threats to our own civil rights.

Before this legislation is approved by the House of Representatives, the members of that body have an obligation they must not ignore, to go through the massive piece of legislation with a fine-tooth comb and eliminate every provision that would in any way infringe on the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.

Until this is done, the bill must not be approved.●

INFANT DAY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing awareness within the United States and especially Minnesota of the dangers associated with the improper use of infant formula in developing countries. This is of particular importance to me, as well as to all of you here, because the promotion of infant formula is primarily directed by companies headquartered in developed nations.

I am concerned about the promotional practices of these corporations. Conditions necessary for the safe preparation of infant formula products are rarely available in these countries. These promotional practices put unfair pressure on women to use infant formula. This is extremely hazardous to the child's health when unsterile water, inadequate hygienic standards, and insufficient income exist.

It is my hope that your action today and other actions across the Nation will result in the companies' examining their marketing practices in terms of human suffering.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of the people of Minnesota on this issue. The Center for Corporate Responsibility and the Infant Formula Action Council have been instrumental in alerting people to this issue for several years. The State of Minnesota has declared today Minnesota Infact Day, and together with the University of Minnesota, has committed the shares of American home products stock to the shareholders' action. The city of St. Paul has also declared this Infact Day in St. Paul, and the DFL has officially supported the shareholders' action. We can all take pride in the knowledge that the citizens of Minnesota are leaders of this issue.

On the national level, I have sent a letter to the corporate officers of the major infant formula manufacturers. This letter, cosigned by 13 of my colleagues, calls for these companies to address responsibly the problems resulting from the aggressive promotion of their products.

As a Nation, we can take pride in our democratic traditions which have made ours the most free and open society in the world. These traditions can be only maintained when individuals and corporations take responsibility for their actions.

The Sunday, April 9, 1978, New York Times published an excellent article describing the shareholders' action, which follows:

INFANT FORMULA: A PROXY ISSUE

WASHINGTON.—Baby formula is becoming a controversial topic during the 1978 annual-meeting season, reflecting the increasing sophistication and aggressiveness of activist shareholders.

Although the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, a coalition of 20 religious groups, has attempted to use the proxy process for four years to change the sales-promotion practices in developing nations by the American Home Products Corporation and other producers of infant formula, its resolution on A.H.P.'s 1978 proxy cards represents the center's first nationwide proxy solicitation campaign to win support for its infant-formula resolution.

Specifically, the New York-based Interfaith Center is calling upon A.H.P. to establish an independent 15-member committee to review its marketing and promotional practices in the third world, where, it contends, the misuse of infant formula, a fortified product fed to babies in bottles to supplement or replace breast milk, has contributed to infant malnutrition, disease and death. Church groups have provided growing documentation that often in poor countries mothers overdilute the formula or mix it with impure water.

The church coalition, which controls 82,690 shares (valued at more than \$2.3 million) of A.H.P.'s more than 158 million common shares, represents the largest group of church investors cosponsoring a single resolution to any company this year.

Leah Margulies, the Interfaith Center's coordinator of the campaign, said in an interview that the group had recently sent more than 500 institutional investors a four-page proxy solicitation.

A.H.P., in response, is digging in its heels and ardently opposing the resolution, although infant formula accounts for less than 2 percent of its earnings. Previously company officials met most of the church groups' demands for disclosure before the group

needed to resort to proxy solicitations. But they have flatly rejected the groups' claim that the company, through questionable promotional practices, pushes infant formula instead of breast milk.

"We do not compete with breast milk only with less suitable, less nutritious products," said Steven Bauer, vice president of Wyeth International, A.H.P.'s subsidiary that manufactures the infant formulas, SMA, S26 and S28.

Last week the company mailed its own statement on the controversy to institutional and large individual investors, opposing it on several grounds:

To vote for it is to accept the groups' allegations of improper marketing.

A watchdog committee would be "intrusive, cumbersome, expensive" and unnecessary in view of the company's practices.

The review committee is actually a challenge to the company's ability to manage its own business affairs.

"It's a question of principle," said Carol G. Emerling, A.H.P. secretary. "If it only takes a tiny minority of the shareholders to call into question the company's management, we're no longer fully in charge of the Company."

The company's arguments do not impress the church groups.

As part of the campaign, the Infant Formula Action Coalition, known as Infact, a sometimes overlapping confederation of more than 40 groups nationwide that are also concerned with the health impact of bottle feeding in the third world, is trying to build support for the resolution among the nation's institutional investors. In Minnesota, home of one of Infact's most active chapters, proponents said they expected the Minnesota State Board of Investments, which owns 260,000 A.H.P. shares, to endorse the proposal soon. Last week, the Minnesota University Committee for Social Responsibility in Investments, which advises the university's Board of Regents, endorsed the proposal. New Jersey groups are also studying it.

In addition, Infact groups are promoting a national boycott of products made by the Nestlé Corporation, an international conglomerate based in Switzerland, the world's leading exporter of infant formula to poor nations. April 13 will be "Infact Day" in several cities where demonstrations are planned.

But the shareholder resolution is still the focus of the groups' campaign against misuse of infant formula, and its supporters say they have already made headway against A.H.P. and other infant formula producers.

David Liff, director of the Investor Responsibility Research Center's task force on infant formula, credits the proliferation of shareholder resolutions with prodding the industry into the formation of a trade association, which in late 1975, adopted an ethical code to curb formula misuse.

Church groups have also proposed a resolution to the Carnation Company, for the first time, seeking disclosure of sales and marketing information, but the Interfaith Center canceled plans for a resolution aimed at the Borden Company, after the company agreed to withdraw all advertising suggesting that Klim, a powdered milk, could be substituted for infant formula.

In another case, the Sisters of the Precious Blood sued Bristol-Myers Inc. in 1976, charging that statements made in its proxy material regarding the company's promotional practices were false and misleading. In what Miss Margulies calls an "important victory" for the infant-formula campaign, Bristol-Myers settled the suit last January, agreeing to mail shareholders a special report on the controversy stating both sides' views and to meet regularly with the groups to discuss marketing practices. In return the church groups agreed not to file a share-

holder resolution with the company this year.

The Interfaith coalition sought and won similar disclosures from A.H.P. in 1975 and 1976 in exchange for the withdrawal of shareholder resolutions.

Last year, the church groups did propose a resolution that would have required A.H.P. to change certain marketing policies and practices. The resolution, which the S.E.C. approved for inclusion on the company's proxy statement, was supported by 2.92 percent of the shares voted at A.H.P.'s annual meeting—just short of the 3 percent the S.E.C. requires for the resolution to be reintroduced automatically. This year the coalition again won S.E.C. approval for its resolution, and separately won the commission's approval to wage the proxy-solicitation campaign. Everything mailed to shareholders relating to a proxy dispute must pass commission scrutiny. Last year the church groups avoided this costly process by simply meeting informally with large shareholders and leaving the resolution to stand on its own among others.

Members of the Interfaith Center are bitter about last year's proxy dispute, because shortly before the annual meeting, the company sent a second proxy card to shareholders who had voted for the resolution, asking whether they had intended to support the resolution. The move led some shareholders to change their ballots, the company agreed.

"It apparently was legal," said Miss Margulies, "but we feel it was certainly unethical, very dirty pool."

Company spokesmen say the shareholders were resolicited because the company had presented the resolution with a series of management-supported resolutions. Some shareholders might have been confused, as a result, they said, and voted for it with the others.

Both last year and this year the S.E.C. rejected the company's requests for permission to exclude the church groups' proposals from its proxy statements. In 1977, the staff ruled that the company could omit the resolution because it dealt with a matter relating to the "conduct of the company's ordinary business operations." In a highly unusual move, the commission reversed the staff's ruling and permitted it.

This year, the staff sided with the church groups; the decision was upheld in an appeal by the commission.

Miss Margulies will not predict whether the Interfaith Center's proxy solicitation campaign, which cost slightly less than \$5,000, will win the 3 percent support needed to raise the issue again next year. But she believes that because the process raises interest in her group's cause, the proxy fight is well worth the effort.

JUDITH MILLER.●

THE AMERICAN FOOD MACHINE AND PRIVATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the House has recently focused its attention on the Nation's farmers. Although the conference report on the Emergency Agricultural Act of 1978 was defeated, the debate on farm policy is far from over. It is therefore appropriate, as a contribution to that debate, that membership read the views of a man who served for 5 years as

Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz. The remarks, printed below, were delivered at Hillsdale College, in Hillsdale, Mich., as a part of the school's Ludwig von Mises lecture series.

THE AMERICAN FOOD MACHINE AND
PRIVATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

(By Earl L. Butz)

The modern American Food Machine is perhaps the greatest single source of strength undergirding the unparalleled level of American living. It is also our number one single source of foreign exchange. At the same time, it is one of the real power bases undergirding our foreign policy.

The first claim of any society upon its total production resources is to produce enough food to keep the population alive and to reproduce itself. This is so evident that it is axiomatic.

We do this in the United States with less than four percent of our labor force on farms and with perhaps no more than another 10 or 15 percent engaged in the agricultural infrastructure—making agricultural production inputs purchased by farmers, and processing and distributing food and fiber produced by farmers.

As recently as a third of a century ago, early in World War II, one worker on American farms produced enough food for himself and about nine other people. Today one farm worker produces enough for himself and some fifty other people. On our more efficient commercial family farms, one worker produces enough to feed over 100 other people.

This remarkable growth in the efficiency and productivity of American agriculture in the last generation forms the real basis for the general affluence we take for granted in America.

Even though the cost of food is a widespread source of complaint, the plain truth is that we Americans buy more food for a smaller share of our working day than ever before, and for less than any other nation.

And we eat better than our fathers did—and better than any other people, everything considered!

As a nation, we now get our food for a little less than 17 percent of our take-home pay. That's 17 percent of what's left after the bite taken by federal and state taxes. This compares with 24 percent of take-home pay required for food just a quarter century ago, when the real level of wages was substantially lower than it is now.

Moreover, that 17 percent of take-home pay for food now buys a lot more services and "extras" than in former years. It includes all the built-in "maid service" in our modern food supply—frozen TV dinners, oven-ready pastries and rolls, processed potatoes, delicatessen items from the supermarket, and so on. And these things don't come for free.

On top of that, the 17 percent includes over one-third of our meals eaten outside the home. When you go out for dinner tonight and enjoy a nice meal that costs, let us say, \$6.00, just pause to think that in that restaurant if the waitress put an empty plate in front of you, it would probably cost \$4.00. That's for service and overhead. Yet, all this is included in the 17 percent of take-home pay we spend for food.

Because we spend only 17 percent of take-home pay for food, by definition, we keep 83 percent to spend on something else or to save.

That's why it's possible in the U.S. for well over 90 percent of our families to have a TV set, and about half to have 2 sets; for some 85 percent of our families to have an automobile, and over 40 percent to have 2 cars; for nearly all of our families to have electricity, indoor plumbing, radio, and a host of other things and services that were

anything but commonplace a generation ago.

Why did this phenomenon of food abundance and economy occur here? Why not in Argentina, where in another hemisphere they have the same good soil and favorable climate we do? Why not in Russia where they have vast land resources and lots of people? Why not in Europe?

A major reason is that the United States is a nation of family farmers, in business for themselves, with their own capital invested, their own family labor involved, trying to make a little money and save some of it.

The American family farm represents entrepreneurship at its best. It is here that we find a direct relationship between personal profit (or at least the hope of profit) and investment, innovation, risk-taking, and just plain old-fashioned hard work and enterprise.

I have seen Russian farm experts come to this country and visit successful American family farms. They have taken back to Russia our large power units, our combines and our pickers, our well-bred livestock, and our high yielding crop varieties. But they don't seem to work very well on the Russian farms, because our Russian visitors never saw that invisible cement that held it all together on the American farm—the farmer and his family in business for themselves, in pursuit of a little more profit than would come to average performance or would result from central governmental direction.

The American farmer hasn't learned yet to punch the clock at 40 hours. If it rains today, tomorrow he rides the tractor 14 hours, with no questions asked. And Mamma drives the truck right beside him.

He hasn't learned yet to go out to the cow stable and say, "Look bossie, I'm going to be gone over the weekend. Let's shut it off for three days."

And, most important of all, he hasn't learned yet to put two drivers in his tractor cab, like in that locomotive that goes through this town.

He can neither afford nor tolerate those slow-down tactics; he's in business for himself—trying to make a little profit. This is the strongest possible motivation for change, for new investment, for rapid adoption of new technology, for increased efficiency, and for expanded output.

How fortunate we are that this is true. How fortunate that this great power base is ours, here in the United States. We must use care not to hobble it, not to impair it, not to diminish it.

We must not panic in our national farm programs in reaction to a temporary surplus situation. Last year was the first in four years that total world grain production exceeded total world grain consumption. For three years before that, we were drawing down inventory. Last year nearly the entire world experienced relatively good growing conditions.

This is unusual. The usual is to experience a major stress area or two somewhere in the world. This year such an area apparently is in mainland China. They have contracted to purchase 11.6 million metric tons of wheat in the next year. They had to be in a serious internal food situation, or else they would not have committed so large a chunk of their precious foreign exchange for that purpose.

In the United States, in the early months of the 1977 crop year, there was widespread concern about the low moisture situation in the Corn Belt and in the Great Plains states. The potential was present for a serious yield-reducing drought right in the very breadbasket of America. Fortunately, the rains came, and 1977 production was good. But the weather margin for us last summer was a narrow one.

Much of the world's turmoil can be traced

to man's quest for food and the quest for land on which to grow that food. Potential food shortages, within a quarter-century, could serve as the catalyst for man's final act of self-destruction. The way in which we view agricultural production today, the priorities the world places on food, will hold the answers.

Agricultural science and development, investment and innovation, profit and incentive can't be turned on and off, willy nilly, in response to the vagaries of weather and production from year to year. Remember, it has been less than three years since we were all stirred up about the "World Food Crisis."

We are now face-to-face with the fact that the world's number one problem is how to feed 80 percent more people in the next quarter-century. Or, to put it another way, allow for slight improvement in individual diets, and the job becomes one of learning in the next 25 years how to feed as many more people as we've learned to feed since the dawn of history.

We must find the answers to this problem at a time when we have no new western hemisphere to discover, no new prairie sods to plow, no more virgin woods in temperate climates to clear and convert into farmland. Indeed, we must double food production at a time when many nations are losing arable land to urban sprawl, highway construction, and recreation.

Demographers predict that in 25 years earth's human population will be 6.5 to 7.0 billion, compared with 4.0 billion today.

Can we feed those 7 billion people 25 years from now?

The answer is simple. Yes, we can—or they won't be here!

The question is not can we feed them, but can we feed them well. For that part of the world's population that often goes to bed hungry, can we make eating an exciting experience? Can we make eating something more than a mere exercise in sustaining life inside the human body?

Can we produce and distribute enough food to generate the sort of happiness and satisfaction that will promote peace?

The answer to all these questions is a resounding yes, if we take positive action on two important fronts:

1. Continue to emphasize agricultural research and technology, both public and private.

2. Continue and strengthen a system of individual freedom and incentives that reach each and every farmer willing to strive for them.

The first of these two will be the less difficult to attain, both here and abroad. Modern technology is transferable; research results can cross oceans and mountains overnight. Scientific developments that have taken 20 years to perfect can be transported to other countries in months.

But the maintenance of incentive systems for the farmer is far more difficult. Yet, it is just as crucial—perhaps more crucial. This is true both here and abroad. Too often we have believed that the road to more food for the developing countries is paved only with science and technology. Yet, those techniques, when transplanted, have sometimes withered on the vine, almost before our own technicians could get out of the field.

Why? There was no real incentive for the farmer to take the risk to change. There was no prospect for profit.

Too few national governments have made the commitment to assure that changes in techniques would provide real incentives to the individual farmer.

Too many nations including our own, have an underlying, but powerful, urge to pursue a cheap food policy—making it difficult for the man on the land to reap the reward for the innovations he makes.

Consumers the world around welcome such a cheap food policy—and politicians respond, whether they're capitalist or communist. As nations become less agricultural and more urban, the incentive base for the farmer becomes less certain. It becomes more susceptible to political pressures and special interest dealings.

Even in this highly literate nation of our own, we have seen repeated attacks on the incentive system for farmers. True, these attacks are most obvious when food prices are in an upward posture, but they none the less persist today. It has only been five months since we had a well publicized "meatless dinner" in the Roosevelt Room of the White House—and that's about as close to the Oval Office as you can get without actually entering it. And this dinner was attended by, among others, the secretary of agriculture and his assistant secretary of agriculture!

It has only been three years since we had such campaigns as the beef boycott, eat one less hamburger per week, or Meatless Tuesdays. It has only been four years since political pressures forced us into a system of federally imposed price ceilings on meats and other food products.

Most of us have forgotten that it has only been three years since the American Bakers Association whipped up a scare campaign that bread would go to a dollar a loaf unless we imposed export controls on wheat.

It was only two years ago that the longshoremen refused to load Gulf port grain that was destined for Russia—on the pretext of keeping living costs under control—while they did some fancy maneuvering of their own to increase shipping subsidies.

Almost unnoticed by most of our people during May-August, 1977 was the official pleasure in Washington as farm prices declined four straight months in a row. The four-month decline of 15.2 percent in farm prices was heralded each month as presaging only modest rises in retail food prices. And that in the face of escalating farm production costs.

The drop in farm prices masked the rise in nearly every other price category and permitted Washington price watchers to interpret a slowing of the overall price gain as evidence that inflation was coming under control.

The consuming public liked this interpretation. It was consistent with their general support of a cheap food policy.

At a recent meeting I addressed, I walked through a group of young protesters carrying placards reading "Food is for people, not for profit." That prompted me to remark to my audience—"I have a message for those misguided youngsters. If there's going to be no profit in food, ultimately, there will be no food for people".

In recent weeks our government itself has taken direct action to curtail output through a requested 20 percent set aside for wheat in 1978, and a probable set aside for feed grains. We are placing our grains into a massive governmental loan and storage program, as we move inexorably toward again making the U.S. a residual supplier in the world grain markets, a primary granary for the world's warehousing, and the residual production adjuster for the world.

The sad part is that these negative signals, these arbitrary restraints, didn't happen in some distant land. They didn't happen in a dictatorial society. They didn't happen in a communist state. They didn't happen under a government dedicated to suppression of human rights. They didn't happen under a political system based almost completely on central planning.

They happened in the United States.

They happened in the world's greatest democracy.

They happened in a nation whose hallmark is freedom of choice and freedom of action.

They happened in a nation whose level of economic literacy is perhaps the highest in the world. They happened in a country where the legislative body reputedly reflects the will of the people better than in any other nation.

Now, we must ask, have we learned any lesson from taking those negative acts? Have we learned that if the United States is indeed to use its great food productive capacity, then the individual farmer must be free to produce and market his crops as he sees fit?

We must not dampen the incentives that have made our farmers the producers that they are. We must not signal to them in the language of price—the language they understand best—that we want less, not more.

We must not constrain their access to markets, both domestic and foreign by politically inspired prices and production directives that create the illusion, even in the short run, that a government warehouse constitutes an enduring market.

Our nation—and indeed every nation of the world—must make the commitment to move agriculture and food to the front burner. It must be moved higher on the scale of priorities in both national policy and in capital allocation.

To do less will be to condemn hundreds of millions of people to such a substandard level of living in a few years that peace will be difficult, if not impossible.

Hungry people will not remain invisible or silent. No matter how remote their village, they now hear of the outside world on transistor radios. They see affluent travelers from North America, Europe and Japan. They now realize that a better life is indeed possible. Increasingly they will not settle for less. They see a ballet of affluence dancing all around them—and they dream of a piece of the action.

Hunger is the stuff out of which revolution is born. And revolutions, once started, have a tendency to spread. They are like a pebble dropped into the pond; there is no way of knowing where the ripple will hit the shore.

The oceans on either side of us are no insulation. Four times in my own generation, the United States has been drawn into conflict away from our shores. There is no way we can avoid it the next time.

That is why this nation's agriculture now commands such a strategic position. That is why it must be kept free and incentive-oriented. Other nations may have Petro-power, but we have Agri-power—and we have it in abundance. It is to our door that nation after nation will come for food and for the know-how to grow better food.

To the extent that we can respond to those needs, we will lay the foundations of peace. America must help the world learn to grow more food. We must use our Agri-power wisely and with strength.

We must not be lulled into believing that somehow we will be able to exist as an Isle of Affluence in a Sea of Human Misery. A hungry world will not allow it. We must make a stronger commitment than ever to keeping our own farmers healthy, and to helping others help themselves.

The best way to accomplish this is through a strong system of incentives for the only one who produces food—the farmer on the land.

There is a synonym for this:
The word is profit.●

CONGRESS NEEDS TO LOOK AT
KEY ISSUES IN TITLE I OF ESEA

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing the 95th Congress is consideration of the renewal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10). This measure, adopted in 1965, has become the major Federal aid-to-education program.

The key element in ESEA has been title I which provided funds for school districts based on the number of children from poor families in the school district. The proponents of this act automatically identified children in poverty as under-achievers and we witnessed a great outpouring of money from U.S. taxpayers into compensatory education programs. We are being asked to pour more money into title I programs.

I have been a critic of the supposed accomplishments of the title I programs. I recognize it is difficult to assess the impact of title I programs. Programs goals may differ from one area to another. Variations may be found in the type of instruction presented, the qualifications of teachers, and the services schools provide. Problems arise for comparisons when there are different methodologies being used and different kinds of students in programs. Yet, despite the unsure and even uncertain results of compensatory education, we are asked not only to continue funding this program but to fund it at higher levels.

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Joseph A. Califano observed that the most substantial change financially in title I is a targeting provision in which President Carter is requesting \$400 million—

... to target on those school children that have high concentrations of poor, disadvantaged children, in rural areas and in urban areas.

He observed that the test for this aspect of the program would be a school district either with 5,000 poor children or more in it or a school district in which 20 percent of the schoolchildren were poor. The Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary estimated that this proposed change would add between 600,000 and 900,000 children to the participants in title I programs. If this change occurs, we will have between 6.2 million and maybe up to 6.5 million children participating.

What has been the result of this effort over the past 12 years? Even Secretary Califano admits that many students are not mastering the fundamentals of education. Recently, the Washington Post carried a story that a group of prestigious education researchers had warned the Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary against giving national or statewide minimum competency exams for high school seniors since so many students would fail that it would be politically unacceptable.

Despite the funds spent on compensatory education, the results are less and less satisfactory.

I raised many of my concerns with the title I program when I testified before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on March 6, 1978. I was pleased to see that some of my thoughts were reflected in a perceptive editorial in the Chicago Tribune entitled "Dollars and Scholarships," March 9, 1978. My colleagues should read this editorial carefully and seriously consider the issues it raises before they vote for additional authorizations under title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

The editorial follows:

DOLLARSHIP AND SCHOLARSHIP

President Carter was right when he said we must do a better job of teaching basic reading, writing, and arithmetic skills to all children. But he should do a little more homework himself if he thinks that the way to accomplish this is to spend 24 per cent more federal money on education—\$12.9 billion in the 1979 budget—as he proposes.

Lack of money for schools is not why so many children are failing to learn to read, write, and calculate adequately. Schools, generally, are not lacking for well-paid teachers, classrooms, or instructional materials—the kinds of problems money can alleviate. Raising school budgets has rarely resulted directly in better performance by pupils.

It may sound useful to urge more money for reading, especially when some funds are to be earmarked for poor urban areas and some spent to encourage state and local demonstration projects. But before throwing more money at the reading problem, it may help to look at some of the reasons the problem exists:

(1) Some children have trouble learning to read because they are taught by inefficient methods which don't give them the modern phonetic tools they need to decode written words at the very start of instruction. Although the evidence is overwhelming, too many old-fashioned teachers textbooks still insist on inefficient look-say or "combination" methods.

(2) Some children are handicapped because they come from homes where parents rarely read themselves or to their children, where newspapers and books are not valued, where language may not even be spoken well. Research shows that early intervention programs—particularly "visiting teachers" and child-parent centers—can make marked and lasting improvements if begun well before children reach kindergarten age.

(3) Specific learning disabilities make it impossible for some children to learn to read easily and well in school. This problem is still not well understood, despite considerable progress in the last decade. While remedial programs help many of these youngsters, they are not completely effective for all. Such children are likely to find the going even tougher, thanks to new laws that require the handicapped to be "mainstreamed" into regular classrooms by next fall whenever possible and regardless of money available for special teachers and programs. Many of them may simply get lost in regular classrooms, where teachers have neither the time nor the training to give them special help.

(4) Basic education suffers in some schools because it loses out to other priorities. Shifting teachers and pupils to satisfy arbitrary racial goals can easily interfere with sound teaching programs, and produces no measurable improvements in learning. Besides, too many administrators are forced to spend their time complying with nitpicking federal

and state regulations rather than on upgrading and monitoring the learning that is supposed to be occurring.

(5) Lastly and perhaps most importantly, too many schools are reluctant to insist that their children do learn. Often promotions are given to avoid hurting egos, or out of administrative laziness, thereby almost guaranteeing that the children promoted will be unable to keep up in the higher grades for which they are unprepared.

The few school districts which have set up firm standards for promotion and graduation, and have held both teachers and students to them, have shown a notable improvement.

How many of these problems can more federal money solve? Not many. If funds go for well planned early learning programs that involve parents, more money could help. But billions of federal dollars won't remedy every problem, especially reading, and Mr. Carter is naive if he assumes so. ●

CHELSEA VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service Act of 1977 (H.R. 7700) which was approved by the House April 6 contains a provision of special importance to many people in my district, particularly those residing in the Chelsea community.

This legislation should generally improve postal services throughout the Nation, and the specific provision directly affecting Chelsea should likewise prove valuable.

Under section 11 of H.R. 7700, any Postal Service capital project expenditure exceeding \$9 million will have to be submitted for review to the appropriate congressional committees. This section further stipulates that the project cannot be initiated until the committees have transmitted a report on it to the Postal Service within a 4-month period.

If and when H.R. 7700 is enacted into law, such a congressional review procedure will be most helpful in assessing the merits of a Postal Service plan to construct a large vehicle maintenance facility in the Chelsea neighborhood.

A number of my Chelsea constituents have objected to the proposed garage which would be built on a square-block site that has stood vacant for several years. The Chelsea community is united in its advocacy for housing at this location, but valid questions about the environmental suitability of the facility have been raised and have not been satisfactorily answered. There is a real possibility that this huge garage would seriously exacerbate the already unacceptable pollution and traffic levels in the area.

I therefore welcome the review mechanism that would be established by H.R. 7700. Should this measure become law, I will urge my colleagues on the appropriate House and Senate committees to undertake a thorough study of the vehicle maintenance project.

Alternative sites for the garage have been proposed, and these should be con-

sidered in any review of the project. A serious housing crisis exists in Chelsea and, in fact, throughout the 20th Congressional District and the Postal Service plan must be carefully evaluated to determine the prospects for housing construction.

Until the capital project review requirement becomes binding, I will continue to work with my Chelsea constituents in finding a suitable solution to the many problems raised by the Postal Service proposal. ●

SUCCESS IN THE CITIES

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take a personal interest in the following article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Tuesday, April 4. This article details the successful experience of Baltimore, Md., with a combination of grassroots involvement and local banking institutions in the area of housing. It has been my privilege to take part in such active and successful grassroots movements.

Unresponsive bureaucracy, lack of local input and control, and massive, wasteful spending are frequent outcries in reaction to many so-called Federal answers to the problems of urban America. One alternative that has proved effective in coping with urban housing problems across the country is the Neighborhood Housing Service organization. Many other cities, in addition to Baltimore, have found the NHS model useful in combining the resources of local businesses and citizens with minimum Federal money or interference. The principle involved can certainly be applied to other problems where the Federal Government now plays too prominent a role.

I insert this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

MIRACLE IN BALTIMORE

(By Neal R. Peirce)

After more than 30 years in a row house in southeast Baltimore's Patterson Park area, Matilda Koval was set to move out. The neighborhood was on the slippery slope to slumdom: There was a fire a week; rats were everywhere; the alleys were so strewn with debris that sanitation trucks couldn't make their way through. European ethnic families like her own were leaving in droves. In her immediate neighborhood alone, 40 to 60 houses were abandoned and boarded up.

That was four years ago. "But nothing can make me move now," says Mrs. Koval, a local legend for Ukrainian pastries and indefatigable organizing talents. The reason: Local residents, led by Mrs. Koval and others, were able to make common cause with Baltimore's banks and savings and loans and city government in a Neighborhood Housing Services organization. And the NHS is performing small miracles in turning a declining neighborhood around.

Since January, 1975, when the NHS opened its doors, the rate of home ownership in many blocks of Patterson Park has risen from as low as 20 per cent to as high as 75 per cent. Residents have gone on a spectacular paint-up, fix-up spree. Loans totaling \$4 million have been secured for people to purchase and rehabilitate their homes. The share of houses

meeting housing code standards has gone from 40 to 80 per cent.

Buoyed by a fresh confidence in their neighborhood, residents have stopped their outward flow and new people, including many young professionals, are moving in. But by channeling the newcomers into larger homes needing major investment, the NHS has been able to keep smaller units for poorer residents and prevent their displacement as renewal proceeds.

The Baltimore NHS is not alone. The same concept, pioneered in Pittsburgh in the late 1960s, is being tried in 52 neighborhoods in 46 cities around the nation, from Chicago (which has four in operation) to San Antonio, from Tampa, Fla. to Oakland, Calif. Twenty-nine new NHSs are now in development. Under a bill passed by the Senate and now awaiting House action, the total would be raised to some 200 by 1981.

But except for technical advice and a minimum of start-up funding, the NHSs have not depended heavily on the federal support. Quite to the contrary, the programs have succeeded because the "feds" are only peripherally involved, because the approach is grass-roots based and free of the layers of bureaucracy and regulations which plague so many government housing efforts.

Up to now, federal guidance has come from the Urban Reinvestment Task Force, a joint effort of the federal financial regulatory agencies and Department of Housing and Urban Development. The pending legislation would create a permanent Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. But it too would be a very independent, quasi-public organization, and doubtless would continue under the guidance of William Whiteside, the genial, bearded Californian who has spread the NHS from coast to coast.

Local NHSs succeed because they are based on a partnership between groups often at loggerheads. The citizens of a neighborhood agree, at least within NHS, to forsake rough confrontation tactics; the city government to provide essential services; the lending institutions to make reasonable risk loans in an area they may have redlined before.

In Baltimore, it was Matilda Koval's block club, working with Baltimore's Southeast Community Organization, one of the country's most broad-gauged and activist local citizens' groups, that formed the nucleus of resident participation. Robert Embry, then Baltimore's housing commissioner (and now an assistant secretary of (SHUD), pledged the city's co-operation for necessary improvements in sanitation, lighting and code enforcement. The lenders, originally very special, were brought into camp by Howard Scaggs, president of Baltimore's American National Building and Loan Association.

But before the Baltimore NHS was launched, 40 community residents, lenders and city officials held a two-day workshop on neutral turf—in Easton, on Maryland's Eastern Shore. There, says Mr. Scaggs, they let out their antagonisms, identified Patterson Park's problems, and finally determined "we should collectively attack the problems instead of each other."

After that the Ford Foundation donated \$100,000. Mr. Scaggs and his savings and loan associates raised \$200,000. The Urban Reinvestment Task Force lent staff support. Mrs. Koval and her friends kept the heat on the city government—and on any laggard neighbors to fix up their properties, by some blunt peer pressure and housing code enforcement.

The NHS operates as a friendly all-around broker. Recognizing that many lower-income people don't know how to approach a banker about a loan, it counsels them on how to do that, helps them apply for urban homesteading or government-sponsored low-interest loans, or where all else fails, offers them extremely inexpensive loans from its own high-risk revolving loan fund.

How widely can NHS projects be extended

around America? Mr. Scaggs believes all of Baltimore, even its most devastated neighborhoods, could one day be covered.

What is clear is that race doesn't make much difference to the program's success. Patterson Park is overwhelmingly white and Catholic—Polish, Ukrainian, Greek, German, Irish, plus a sprinkling of Orientals and Lumbee Indians, and only 10 per cent blacks. But nationwide, 52 per cent of NHS neighborhoods have more than 50 per cent black or Hispanic residents, some close to 100 per cent.

Mr. Whiteside has repeatedly warned that the NHS concept shouldn't be expanded too rapidly lest the quality of staff work and sensitivity in stimulating local initiatives be lost—a rare modesty and aversion to empire-building among bureaucrats.

But he is anxious to experiment increasingly with fresh strategies to preserve and restore neighborhoods. Five efforts in neighborhood commercial revitalization have been started. An apartment improvement program, begun in Yonkers, N.Y., and soon to be tried in Hartford, enlists lenders, property owners and tenants in a partnership to upgrade deteriorated multi-unit buildings.

On the drawing boards—or at least in the embryonic stage—are experimental strategies to manage and market vacant buildings, to cope with neighborhood crime, to bring the schools into a closer partnership in community revival.

With the average big federal department, one would have to shudder at such an ambitious agenda. But as long as Mr. Whiteside and his colleagues can grow slowly and remain insulated from the greater Washington bureaucracy, acting simply as catalysts for actions that local people themselves must launch and maintain, the dangers may be minimal. Indeed, this may be one of the very few federally inspired efforts in which more—not less—is better.●

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN AL ULLMAN, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, WITH RESPECT TO THE RULE TO BE REQUESTED ON H.R. 6853, RELATING TO THE PAYMENT OF EXCISE TAXES IN THE CASE OF FISHING EQUIPMENT

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has ordered H.R. 6853 favorably reported to the House with amendments. The bill relates to the timing of excise tax payments on the sale of fishing equipment.

I take this occasion to advise my Democratic colleagues as to the nature of the rule that I will request for consideration of H.R. 6853 on the floor of the House. The Committee on Ways and Means specifically instructed me to request the Committee on Rules to grant a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 6853 which would provide for (a) committee amendments which would not be subject to amendment; (b) 30 minutes of general debate, to be equally divided; and (c) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The committee expects to officially report the bill and file its report by April 21. It is our intention to request a hearing before the Committee on Rules as expeditiously as possible.●

THE BACKFIRE BOMBER ARGUMENT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post the highly respected columnist George Will addresses the issue of the Soviet Backfire bomber and how it is to be counted in the SALT negotiations. It is an acknowledged fact that the Backfire is a strategic aircraft—that is, it has the range and capability to attack the continental United States. It has been designed for in-flight refueling.

In 1976 the CIA commissioned performance analyses of the Backfire from the three U.S. aircraft companies that have extensive experience with bomber aircraft—Boeing Co., General Dynamics, and North American Rockwell. All three, in separate independent analyses, estimated the range of the Backfire to be between 5,200 and 5,600 miles.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is that even if the present operational range of the Backfire were to be no more than 3,500 miles as Mr. Herbert Scoville would have us believe, any improvements that the Soviets made in jet engine technology in the future could result in a 35- to 50-percent increase in operational range without making modifications to the aircraft itself. This would be completely unverifiable by the United States.

I would like to include the George Will column in my remarks and commend him for his thoughtful analysis:

BACK TO THE BACKFIRE ARGUMENT

Lawyers have an axiom: If you have the law on your side, argue the law; if you have the evidence on your side, argue the evidence; if you have neither, pound the table. In an overwrought letter in response to my recent column on the Soviet Backfire bomber, Herbert Scoville pounds the table.

Scoville once was a government disarmament adviser, and his arguments are of interest, if only because they are, in primitive form, arguments the Carter administration will use in defense of the strategic arms limitation agreement it is negotiating. Scoville's ill-temperedness is understandable: He has the unenviable task of defending the administration's position that Backfire is not a strategic weapon and so need not count against Soviet strategic-arms limits.

Scoville's bald assertion that Backfire cannot return to Soviet bases after striking targets in the United States is misleading because Backfire can be refueled, and it is irrelevant because Backfire can strike the United States and land in a third country, such as Cuba. (Many U.S. strategic bombers counted in SALT also would land in third countries. No U.S. strategic bomber can return to the United States after a strike against the Soviet Union without refueling.)

Scoville challenges the statement that the administration has accepted 600-kilometer range limits on cruise missiles. In fact, the administration has accepted such limits on all armed ground-launched cruise missiles, all armed sea-launched cruise missiles, and all armed air-launched cruise missiles except those carried on "heavy bombers."

Because of President Carter's unilateral and unreciprocated decision to cancel the B1 bomber, the only heavy bombers the United

States will have for the foreseeable future are the aging B52s.

Scoville suggests that if the United States insisted that Backfire count against Soviet SALT totals, the Soviets would insist on counting U.S. F111s and F4s based in Europe and on carriers. But F111s and F4s are hardly comparable to Backfires: They have much less range and much lighter payloads than Backfires have.

Of course, if the Soviets want to count U.S. planes deployed to defend our allies, the Soviets should be willing to count the enormous and expanding systems with which they threaten our allies. And, of course, Scoville knows, but does not care to dwell upon, the fact that the Soviets are unwilling to do so.

To understand why the Soviets are unwilling, consider the most recent argument from Arthur Cox, whose ringing defense of the Soviets' position on Backfire started this agreeable tempest. Cox, who is a paid consultant to the administration, says that if the administration had insisted that Backfire count as a strategic weapon, then the Soviets would have insisted that FB111s count against U.S. totals. Cox notes that the Soviets have not "demanded" inclusion of FB111s in strategic totals.

Perhaps Cox thinks that is an example of Soviet magnanimity. On the other hand, it could have something to do with the fact that the Soviets soon will have nearly three times more Backfires than the United States has FB111s.

Cox also notes that the Soviets have not "demanded" that we include our fighter-bombers based in Europe, Asia and on carriers. But it would be startling indeed if they did demand that theater forces be included in the equation.

Here is how the balance looks for medium-range missiles: U.S., 0; U.S.S.R., 600 (SS4s, SS5s) plus the new SS20s being deployed. And medium bombers U.S., 60 (FB111s); USSR, approximately 600 (Badgers and Blinders).

As to other nuclear-capable aircraft of less than intercontinental range, the Russians also have an advantage. In Europe alone they have roughly 1,400 against the United States' 400. (These figures are from the 1976 annual report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.)

Cox's most revealing argument consists of quoting the Soviet statement that "to raise such questions would lead matters to a situation where there will be no agreement at all." And there you have the administration's negotiating posture. The Soviets determine the agenda for negotiations and then the substance of agreements, because they know the administration believes that almost any agreement is preferable to no agreement.

The final argument that will be heard from the administration before the Senate rejects the SALT agreement will be: This is better than nothing.

By a considerable margin, the Senate will disagree. ●

THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE EXPANSION ACT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few years, especially of the last several months, have American farmers worried about what 1978 will bring. The agricultural strike has shown this concern in the Nation's Capital and many other communities across the land.

A large number of farmers who have decided not to strike are nonetheless restless and discontent. My contacts and correspondence with ninth district farmers have convinced me that the malaise runs very deep indeed. There is among them a widespread feeling that American agriculture has been dealt a severe blow. They are fretting about low prices at market, soaring production costs, a decreasing share of the consumer food dollar, a declining farm population, rising farm imports and sagging farm exports. Pessimists are even talking about the demise of a way of life that is older than the Nation itself.

THE CONCERNS OF FARMERS

A brief look at the 1977 statistics on the finances of American agriculture reveals that there is cause for some alarm. Under the influence of slackening world demand for our food and fiber, national farm income slipped to about \$20 billion, a mere 60 percent of the record \$33.3 billion earned in 1973. When adjusted for inflation, the 1977 income figure was the lowest in over 40 years. Return on farm equity, which averaged 3.3 percent during the 1960's and 6 percent between 1972 and 1975, dropped to 2 percent. Farm debt reached \$116 billion, up 15 percent from 1976 and double the level of only 5 years before. The prices of key commodities such as corn and wheat, which sold for up to \$4 and \$6 a bushel just a few years before, fell sharply with many farmers failing to break even on average per bushel production costs of \$2.20 for corn and \$3 for wheat. In the first 9 months of 1977 alone, overall farm costs rose 4 percent while prices fell 7 percent. Approximately 10 percent of all farmers were caught in a cost-price squeeze described by the experts as "dangers". These were generally newer farmers who purchased their land and equipment, or older farmers who expanded their operations, in the "boom years" of the 1970's. Other farmers were getting by, but the prosperity they recently enjoyed seemed long gone.

There are other matters of grave concern to our farmers beyond the current cost-price squeeze. Many of them fear the long-term effects of their inability to control their prices and costs. Our modernized, energy-intensive agriculture carries with it the potential to produce unbelievable quantities of food—and bin-busting surpluses with no market outlet. History shows that our efforts to reduce the output of this efficient industry have not always met with success. Our agriculture also requires a greater dependence on high-cost services and goods. Farm products move to market in a transportation system that is increasingly costly to operate and always susceptible to the actions of labor. Shipping and loading costs sometimes loom as large as the expenses of planting and harvesting. The trucker, the railman, and the dockworker have become as important to the farmer as the hired hand. In addition, the costs and availability of fertilizer, fuel, machinery, and pesticides make long-range planning difficult. The only certainty is that these items will be more scarce and higher priced in future

years. Farmers, just as many other businessmen, are now captive to the decisions of corporate managers, labor leaders, and oil ministers. Farming is no longer the free-standing, self-sufficient enterprise it once was.

Another issue of concern to our farmers is their decreasing share of the consumer food dollar. Many ninth district farmers have complained to me about the ever-increasing bite of the middlemen who stand between them and consumers. There can be no doubt that the middleman's share is enlarging at the expense of the farmers because there is no other way to explain the fact that prices in the supermarket have risen while prices on the farm have stabilized or fallen. The recent statistics are clear enough. Last year, personal food expenditures by Americans reached \$218 billion. The farmer's share of the total was about \$56 billion, or 30 percent. However, the share of the total that went to pay the labor costs of marketing was about \$58 billion, or 31 percent. It has been pointed out that 1977 was the first year in which the farmer's share was smaller than the share of marketing labor. Should this trend continue, the farm-product component of food costs could become so insignificant that even the greatest changes in producer prices would have little effect on consumer prices. We do not need to be told about the ultimate consequences of dealing the farmer out of the free-market game of supply and demand. Suffice it to say that they would be dangerous for farmers, middlemen, and consumers alike.

Still another problem for our farmers is the declining farm population. According to figures based on regular surveys taken by the Bureau of the Census, farm population dropped by 1.4 million, or 14 percent, between 1970 and 1976. In the latter year it reached a new low of 8.3 million persons. Thus, fewer than 1 in every 25 Americans now lives on a farm, as opposed to one in every four in 1935, when the farm population numbered 30.5 million persons. The number of farms in the United States has fallen as well, from 6.8 million in 1935 to 2.8 million in 1976. The problem of fewer farmers and farms is not really one of production. The output of crops and livestock has actually climbed 20 percent since 1970. Rather, it is a problem of "political clout." Secretary Bergland, himself a former Member of Congress, is fond of remarking that the American farmer is outgunned 400 to 35 in the House of Representatives. Of course, less farm strength in the halls of Congress means that farmers have less opportunity to promote the legislation they need and less chance to block the legislation they do not want. Some observers have cited the meat price controls of 1973 and the various farm export restraints of 1973-75 as actions of an urban-oriented Congress too sensitive to food prices and not sensitive enough to farm problems. They believe that such controls and restraints could not have been put into effect when farmers were better represented.

A further difficulty faced by our farmers is the agricultural produce being im-

ported into the United States from abroad. Although many of the imports—such as coffee, cocoa, tea, spices and tropical fruits—are not produced in commercial quantities here at home, others—such as meat and meat byproducts—are. The import market thus reflects a consumer demand for foods and food preparations that could be satisfied at least in part by American farmers without any change in consumer preferences. The value of agricultural imports rose from \$11 billion in 1976 to \$13.5 billion in 1977. Much of the increase was due to higher unit prices, not greater volume, but there is little consolation in that fact since every consumer dollar committed to the purchase of imported food is a consumer dollar which escapes the grasp of our farmers. Because our market is one of the freest and most open in the world, the prospect is that agricultural imports will continue to climb in value.

THE PROBLEM OF FARM EXPORTS

A final concern of farmers is the uncertain export market for their produce. While the value of farm exports was up 5 percent in 1977 to \$24 billion, volume was down 4 percent to 100 million metric tons. An export price index that averaged above its 1976 level accounted for the contrary trends. Besides lower export volume, farmers were troubled by the slippage of certain key commodities. The value of wheat exports plummeted 28 percent to \$2.9 billion, with volume declining 8 percent to 25.5 million tons, the lowest volume since 1972. The average export unit value of wheat (\$115 per ton) was more than one-fifth below its 1976 level. Exports of feed grains fell 19 percent in value to \$4.9 billion, with volume down 6 percent to 48.5 million tons and average export unit value (\$101 per ton) off more than one-tenth. Also, the value of exported vegetables and meats dropped 6 percent and 1 percent, respectively, to earnings of \$674 million for vegetables and \$617 for meat. As these statistics show, wheat and feed grains are the sore spots.

There can be no denying that the world grain situation has changed. The chronic shortfalls of the recent past have given way to huge surpluses. World production of wheat and coarse grains will probably reach 1.1 billion tons this year, only 4 percent below the record harvests of last year. This bounty comes at a time when immense stocks of these commodities are already on hand. By the end of this year, there should be about 165 tons of wheat and coarse grains in storage, enough to satisfy about 15 percent of world need. The United States will be holding about 45 percent of the surplus, but much of the remainder will be concentrated in the developing nations where grain deficits have been traditional. The case of India is a helpful illustration. Two favorable monsoons have boosted grain production to such an extent that government-held stocks are approaching 20 percent of annual consumption. Indian agricultural experts have considered the option of making India a grain exporter. It is apparent that the abundance of grain in India and other developing nations has closed those

markets to the American grain farmer, at least in the short term.

The problems of the would-be grain exporter are especially acute, but we should not overlook the problems of exporters of other agricultural commodities. Farmers today are facing the prospect of increased competition in most world food markets. The chaotic fluctuations in supply and demand of the past few years are yielding to more stable conditions in which nations worry less about food shortages. Total world output of food in 1977 was up 1 percent over the previous year and per capita food production was only slightly below the 1976 record. Total output and per capita production were up 14 and 6 percent, respectively, over the critically low levels of 1972. Such prosperity in successive years is bound to complicate the life of the exporter. Many experts have forecast a mixed farm export scenario for 1978. The value of farm exports this year will range from \$22 to \$24 billion, either equal to or below last year's value. On the other hand, the volume of farm exports will be about 110 million tons, a 10-percent increase.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM EXPORTS

During one of my recent visits to the ninth district, a well-intentioned urban constituent asked me why there is so much talk about the farmer. "I know we couldn't eat without him," he said, "but every time I turn around the Congress is looking at another farm bill." This puzzled constituent failed to take account of the enormous economic significance of American agriculture. Like so many other people, he was thinking of how few farmers there are, not how much those few do. Farming, the largest American industry, is in fact the backbone of the national economy. Our 4.4 million farmworkers make up one-fifth of all private business in the United States. Last year farmers spent \$40 billion to live and another \$85 billion on agricultural production. In 1975, farmers spent \$2.4 billion on tractors, \$1.2 billion on cars and trucks for business use and \$5.2 billion on other machinery and equipment alone. They maintain assets of \$730 billion and pay interest on their substantial debt. This economic vitality is not limited to the farm itself. In one way or another, farmers provide a living for millions of merchants, bankers, schoolteachers, and others who serve the farm community. Also, the production, processing, and distribution of food account for one-fifth of the gross national product and employ more than 15 percent of the total civilian work force. Simply put, it is not possible to overestimate the economic importance of farming.

If agriculture is the backbone of the national economy then exports are the backbone of agriculture inasmuch as they provide the farmer with a good share of his market. Exports have other benefits, too. They reduce the trade deficit, stimulate growth in the agricultural sector and help the American consumer. Perhaps we can better understand our farmers' worries about exports if we consider

briefly the various contributions that exports make.

Those who know agriculture well know that it depends on exports to sustain its production. Without exports farmers would constantly face the grim dilemma of staggering surpluses or drastic cutbacks in production. It is a truism that the American agricultural machine is much too efficient to be contained within the limits of the domestic market alone. In 1976 over 337 million acres were harvested—the most in two decades—and about 100 million of those acres produced for export. The latter figure represents twice the export acreage of the 1950's and half again that of the 1960's. Many farmers dedicate far more than this average ratio of land to export. For example, those who market wheat and soybeans export over half their produce. In cotton and rice the figure is over 40 percent. Sizeable portions of other commodities—such as tobacco and feedgrains—also go abroad. All in all, today's farmer receives about one-fifth of his income from sales overseas. The view from Europe, Asia and South America is just as impressive. The American farmer is supplying about 16 percent of the value of all agricultural commodities that move in world trade, up from 12 percent in 1971. The breakdown of this percentage is striking. Of the major commodities being sold around the world, three-fourths of the soybeans, half the wheat, one-third the cotton and one-fifth the vegetable oils are American-grown. In addition, about 70 percent of all food aid originates on our shores. There can be no question of the great reliance of many nations on our high-quality farm products.

A second benefit of agricultural exports is the positive contribution they make to America's international trade account. Agriculture, which has contributed a surplus to that account every year since 1960, enables the country to import everything from oil and strategic raw materials to fully manufactured consumer items. The dollar would face disaster in international money markets and our role in the world economy would be compromised if we could not finance these imports properly. Of course, most people are well aware that our trade position has been deteriorating. The rapid rise in oil imports, our own economic expansion and the slower growth of the economies of our major trading partners resulted in \$27 billion worth of red ink in 1977 and may be followed by a \$25 billion to \$30 billion shortfall this year—levels nearly triple the 1976 deficit of \$9.2 billion. Our trade position is bad, but there is no telling how much worse it would be without the usual surplus of \$10 billion or more registered by our farmers. It is apparent that we will continue to need all the "trade relief" we can get from the agricultural sector.

I have already mentioned that exports provide the farmer with a good share of his market. It should come as no surprise, then, that a third benefit of agricultural exports is the positive effect they have on the farm economy. Economists have taken note of the salient features of this

"export stimulus." The dollar that the farmer earns abroad moves quickly through the economy. Every such dollar he returns to the farm sector is more than doubled in the economy. The consequences for business activity and employment are quite remarkable. As concerns business activity, farm exports created nearly \$50 billion worth as early as 1975—\$30 billion in the agricultural sector itself and \$20 billion in the support sectors of food processing, transportation, warehousing, wholesaling, retailing, and so forth. As concerns employment, about one-half million farmworkers are required to produce for export. Another half million people have jobs in the support sectors that are dependent on farm exports in one way or another. Farm sales in foreign countries are now, and will continue to be, the economic engine that drives rural America.

Expert commentators on the farm scene will go on and on where talk turns to the benefits of exporting American agricultural products. Beyond the three obvious benefits I have discussed, there are scores of additional ones. Farm exports make the American consumer one of the best fed in the world. Contrary to the popular belief that exports drive food prices up and despite a twofold increase in exports since 1970, the disposable income left over after food purchases has inched up—not down—to 83.1 percent of income since 1970, a rise of four-tenths of 1 percent. This means that the average American still spends more on his car than on his groceries. The economic mechanism at work here is no mystery: consumers benefit from exports because the exports allow farmers to be more efficient by maintaining full production at the lowest possible unit cost. Farm exports also carry tremendous weight in our foreign relations. Our food aid programs—especially those commonly called "concessional"—have helped countries to build their economies, to feed millions of hungry after devastation and to offset the detrimental effects of skyrocketing populations. Such generosity is not often forgotten, even in times of political turmoil and change in the recipient nations. Finally, farm exports save the taxpayers money because the farmer can depend on a market and not on the Government for his income. Although it is difficult to say just how much the Federal farm budget has been reduced by exports, there is general agreement that the reduction in the cost of the subsidy programs has been sharp.

The more we think about farm exports, the more important they seem to be. On a recent visit to the ninth district I watched a Hoosier farmer hard at work in his fields. It occurred to me that he might not realize just how indispensable he had become to people all over the world. The cares of the international community—peace and economic development—seemed very far away, but they were being decided right there where a plow cut the earth and a man cast an occasional glance toward the sky. Those of us who deliberate on policy would do well to ponder carefully what we can do to stabilize and encourage the

export of our farm produce. This is an age of superlatives, but it is exaggeration to say that there are few issues of greater urgency.

WHY FARM EXPORTS HAVE GROWN

To better understand what we should do we must first understand why agricultural exports have assumed a central place in our economy. They have not always occupied such a place. Late in 1972, however, there began an "export surge" unprecedented in our history. A number of factors paved the way for it. Consider both the factors that are beyond our reach and those that we can control.

Bad weather in many parts of the globe was one of the forces behind the export surge. Drought and cold devastated crops and led to meager harvests in nations that traditionally produced enough to make farm imports incidental. In 1972, adverse weather in the Soviet Union and China sharply increased our farm exports to those countries through 1974. Similarly, poor weather on the Asian subcontinent in 1973 boosted our exports of rice and wheat to that region through 1975. Bad weather struck here at home in 1974, keeping the value of our exports up. The following year brought another marginal Soviet crop, and a severe drought hit Europe in 1976. Last year saw adverse weather in China, North Africa, and Asia. The weather has certainly been a key to the new found international stature of the American farmer. He is one of the few with sufficient strength to keep the crops growing and the exports flowing even when the weather would have it otherwise. Immense productivity may sometimes be a curse, but it may also be a blessing in disguise.

A second factor in the export surge was rising income and hope for a better life in much of the world. In the developed countries, average per capita income is expected to reach \$4,000 per year in 1980, up 22 percent from the 1970 figure of \$3,100. The large income gap between rich and poor shows few signs of narrowing, but the group of so-called middle-income developing nations—in North Africa, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin America—has an average per capita income of \$900 per year that has recently been increasing by as much as 4 percent to 6 percent annually. The 1 billion inhabitants of these nations are noticeably better off than they were just a few years ago. In addition, the developing world as a whole has an average per capita income that is growing about one-third faster than that of the industrial countries at a comparable stage of their development. Recent growth rates of developing countries have also been higher than in the developed world. Of course, the American farmer has benefited from these trends. More and better food is one of the first items on the "shopping list" of a family just beginning to enjoy some small increase of prosperity.

A final factor behind the export surge was our agricultural policy. By general consensus, our domestic farm programs of the past decade—unlike those, for ex-

ample, of the protectionistic European Community have been sensitive to conditions of international trade and consequently have served to keep American farm commodities competitive in world markets. At the international level itself, the devaluation of the dollar, the existence of a foreign marketing base laid down in the 1960's, major trade negotiations and the opening of trade relations with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China have all played a positive role. Trade relations with the non-market-economy nations are especially noteworthy since the United States in general—and American agriculture in particular—have been primary beneficiaries of the East-West link. In the period from 1970 to 1976, total trade between East and West almost quadrupled in value from \$13 billion to \$48 billion. Our entry into these previously untapped markets expanded our export volume and helped to move our trade account toward balance. As might have been suspected, the East-West link brought on massive growth in our farm exports to the East. Between 1970 and 1976, our farmer's shipments to the non-market-economy nations jumped in value from \$210 million to \$3 billion. In terms of "export mix," the agricultural share of our total exports to the East climbed from 50 percent in 1970 to 62 percent in 1976. Filling a void that these nations could not fill themselves was certainly in the best interests of our farmers. That it may also have been in the best interests of those who received our food is consistent with the spirit of détente.

THE FUTURE OF FARM EXPORTS

What does the future hold for the American farmer? We must be very concerned with his well-being this year, but we should not let the crush of present circumstances blind us to events a few years down the road. One of the most pressing questions in the longer term is clear enough: Will the farmer's export market expand or contract? That is, will farm exports continue the general upward movement that began late in 1972 or will they drop down toward the levels we knew before the surge? The answer is of critical importance because, as we have seen, exports are so essential to the farm economy. My survey of the literature on the future of agricultural exports convinces me that there are several factors which may prompt ever greater exports in the future. Again, some of these factors are beyond our reach while others can be controlled. Let us consider what they are.

The uncertainty of the weather must loom large in any consideration of the future of farm exports. Most meteorologists believe that the relatively good weather of the past few years cannot continue. They point out that such regions as the Asian rice bowl and the Russian wheatlands are places where bad weather tends to be the rule rather than the exception. A long drought in the former or a sudden freeze in the latter—events which have happened so many times before—could occur again, wiping

out the food reserves we think so large and putting a strain on the unparalleled productivity of the American farmer. In fact, many experts who have studied the matter must be described as quite pessimistic. They say that altogether probable variations in weather are bound to cause severe food shortages simply because the world supply is so precariously balanced. They caution us to base our agricultural policies on the possibility of weather extremes in any locale, not on optimum growing conditions. Some of the experts have even gone so far as to predict long-range changes in climate—that is, changes in overall weather patterns—that could make American agriculture the permanent mainstay of the world food economy and the only hedge against starvation on a global scale. While we can only pray that such predictions are wrong, we should help our farmers prepare for the challenge that may lie ahead. What these experts are suggesting our farmers have known for sometime: Weather and climate can often mean more than all the agricultural policies of the world combined.

Any assessment of the future of farm exports must take into account the burgeoning world population. In this regard, the problems to be weighed are really two—food distribution and food production—though the former is the more immediate one. By most estimates the world already produces enough food to provide the entire human race with a nutritionally balanced diet of 65 grams of protein and 3,000 calories daily. The twin specters of malnutrition and starvation continue to stalk a quarter of the world's four billion inhabitants because the mechanisms to distribute the oversupply of food are not adequate to the numbers to be fed. However, this ironic situation will become worse before it becomes better. The more serious problem of food production may be upon us sooner than we think. With it may come difficulties in food distribution that would make our present mechanisms seem efficient. Many demographers anticipate that by the year 2000 the world's population will approach 6.5 billion. If certain of their fundamental assumptions are only slightly off, the population could reach a full 7 billion—as many as 2 billion more than were expected just a decade ago. World food needs will probably have doubled by the year 2010. Moreover, some 50 percent of all people will be living in cities more or less remote from the sources of food supply. The comparable figure today is 39 percent. The impending "food crisis" may make the energy crisis seem pale by comparison. In any case, the American farmer will certainly be called upon to step into the breach.

The recovery of the world economy from the 1974-75 recession is, despite its slow and painful character, another sign that our farm exports may pick up in the coming years. The pressure of double-digit inflation has eased to more acceptable levels and unemployment is beginning to edge down. Reasonably encouraging growth targets (4.5 percent for the Economic Community, 4.5 per-

cent to 5 percent for the United States, and so forth) are being set. Resulting higher personal income abroad should attract our farm exports as foreign consumers choose to improve their diets. However, in our enthusiasm for better economic conditions we should not ignore the serious troubles that remain. Staggering balance-of-payments problems, brought on in large measure by costly oil imports, are causing national economic planners to proceed with caution. Many nations are reluctant to prime their economies for expansion out of fear of renewed inflation. World economic growth is not as strong as we would prefer since it is substantially below its prerecession levels, but a "growth recession" (as some economists have termed it) is better than a plain recession. It is hoped that policies of patience and prudence will pay off in the long run.

A fourth factor likely to affect our farm exports is the current round of trade negotiations—the so-called Tokyo round underway in Geneva. These negotiations, now in their final stages, are intended to free up world trade by reducing national trade barriers. Reductions in tariffs and nontariff barriers such as quotas are under consideration. Under a timetable agreed to last summer, major participants are aiming to reach a broad consensus this summer on the elements to be contained in a package of new multilateral trade agreements. The package may contain:

General tariff reductions of up to 40 percent to be phased in over a period of 8 to 10 years;

Agricultural trade rules to provide for greater market access, supply and price stability and safeguards against world famine;

Improved rules governing the use of temporary import relief;

New limits on the use of export subsidies and measures to counteract export subsidies;

Uniform customs valuation systems and tighter controls on quotas and licensing systems; and

A new "code of conduct" to prevent the abuse of anticompetitive domestic policies that affect exports.

Our farmers have a critical stake in these negotiations. It is essential that their export interests not be sacrificed in an attempt to gain trade advantages for other less efficient American industries. It is also essential that the protectionism of the large agricultural markets—the European Community and Japan, to name just two—be lessened. Our farmers will surely benefit from fairer international commerce. Their productivity alone gives them the power they need to compete head-to-head with any of the world's agricultural producers.

Yet another factor which will determine the future of our farm exports is our marketing policy. In today's competitive environment, an aggressive, well-funded policy is what we need. Our agricultural products will not sell themselves. On the contrary, they must be sold in conditions where buyers have a wide range of choices before them. This means that our marketing policy must

be double edged; improved market development must go hand-in-hand with improved marketing technique. In the area of marketing policy we have some fierce competitors. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Israel, South Africa, and other leading agricultural producers together spent more than \$146 million on the promotion of farm products in 1976, a gain of 3.5 percent over the previous year and 56.9 percent over 1966. Leading the way were Israel (1.54 percent of export earnings spent) and Australia (1.1 percent of export earnings spent). By comparison, the United States spent \$21.6 million for the promotion of farm products in the same year, 5 percent less than a year before and only 4 percent more than in 1970. This expenditure equaled a mere 0.1 percent of export earnings. There is ample room for improvement here.

A sixth item in the future of our farm exports is our relationship with the non-market-economy nations—specifically, the countries of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China. As I mentioned before, American agricultural trade with these nations has increased dramatically in this decade. Eastern Europe bought American farm products valued at \$1.2 billion in 1977, up from \$100 million in 1969. Preliminary estimates put the 1977 value of our farm exports to the Soviet Union at \$1.1 billion, up from \$11.6 million 8 years before. China imported about \$625 million worth of our farm products in 1973 and 1974, after which it ceased to be a significant market for us. However, it returned to the American farmer last year to purchase \$66 million in soybeans and cotton. Summing these figures, we find that these non-market-economy nations made up 12.5 percent of our 1977 farm export market. Aside from the traditional factors that influence trade among nations, an increase of our farm sales in the East awaits change in two additional areas: improvement in overall diplomatic relations and removal of ideologically motivated barriers to trade.

The advent of détente, with its better East-West commercial relations, has done much to confirm the belief that trade flourishes when mistrust and hostilities are reduced. Consequently, additional efforts to find points of accommodation with the Soviet Union and its Eastern Europe neighbors should provide positive results for our farmers. As we look forward to further trade benefits of diplomacy, however, our relationships with China stands out. If the diplomatic progress already made could be consolidated and momentum toward normalization recaptured, there would be a strong probability of large farm exports to that nation. China alone numbers among its population one-fourth of the world's inhabitants. Its desire to raise the standard-of-living of its people has been translated into purchases of wheat abroad. Annual import volumes of 9 million tons may be registered, but this wheat will come from Argentina, Australia, and Canada—not from the United States.

The removal of ideologically motivated barriers to trade with the East is just as important as an improvement in overall diplomatic relations. From the standpoint of the enterprising businessman, such impediments to trade can be more chilling than Government overregulation. One of the more prominent of these barriers is title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, a provision of law which prohibits the granting of most-favored-nation status and the issuing of Government credits to most Communist countries. At the present time, these restrictions are in effect for all Communist nations except Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Thus, the nonmarket-economy giants—the Soviet Union and China, as well as some of the industrialized nonmarket-economy states, East Germany and Czechoslovakia—are denied full access to our markets and are kept from making credit purchases of our goods. The latter restriction hurts our farmers directly since credit sales cannot be made. The former hurts them indirectly since international traders who do not open their own markets cannot expect to find every market open to them. When all is said and done, trade is a two-way street.

The seventh, and final, item in the future of our farm exports is the condition of our Government credit programs. One of the principal initiatives—food for peace—has been used for more than 23 years to provide food and fiber to developing countries that do not have the funds on hand to pay cash. Under food for peace, American farm products are sent abroad on "concessional" credit extended for 20 to 40 years, in most cases at 3 percent interest. In all, some \$26 billion worth of farm products have been shipped out bearing the food-for-peace emblem. Current volume is running at about 6.5 million tons per year. Although food for peace is intended primarily to alleviate hunger and reduce farm surpluses, another of its aims is economic development. The idea is to help a recipient nation so that it can eventually "graduate" from concessional food purchases to commercial ones. Boosters of the development aspect of the program point out that among the early recipients were post war Japan and 17 war-scarred nations of Europe, all of which became commercial importers by 1969. Those who are skeptical of this development aspect contend that the track record of the developing nations in the Third World is not nearly so strong.

The other principal initiative—the Commodity Credit Corporation export credit sales program—was designed to help the United States maintain its share of traditional markets and establish new outlets for farm products. This program provides short-term commercial credit to countries willing to buy American food but unable to put down cash. The normal term of credit is 1 year, though a 3-year period is allowed. Rates of interest have varied from 6.5 to 12 percent in recent years. Also, the supply from which the commodity is to be bought must be in excess of American domestic needs and export requirements, and the sale of the com-

modity must not displace normal commercial sales. From 1964 to 1974 the program accounted for 4 percent of all our farm exports. Its budget peaked in 1973 at over \$1 billion, plunged sharply through 1975 and recovered after that. Credit totaling \$1.7 billion will be available this year, a new record.

THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE EXPANSION ACT

As I have noted, the future of our farm exports will be determined to some extent by factors beyond our control. There are, however, things we can and should do to help insure that our farmers remain a potent force in world agricultural markets. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I join my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Representative PAUL FINDLEY, and other Members of Congress in sponsorship of the Agricultural Trade Expansion Act. I am certain that this reasonable, measured response to the problem of farm exports would do much to keep the agricultural sector healthy in these trying times.

The first major provision of the bill would allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to extend credit over periods of 3 to 10 years to willing buyers of our farm products. This new "intermediate" credit initiative would bridge the gap between the generous concessional terms of Food for Peace and the strict commercial terms of the export credit sales program and would prompt more nations to graduate from concessional to commercial food purchases. Many countries might make such a move, but the most likely candidates for graduation would include nine concessional credit recipients with an annual per capita gross national product of more than \$550: Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Korea, Lebanon, Peru, Portugal, Syria, and Tunisia. Also, nations which were too rich to buy on concessional terms but too strapped to buy on present commercial terms would be encouraged to seek our farm export credit. Finally, an intermediate credit initiative would bolster our sales position by allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to compete more evenly with such nations as Argentina, Australia, and Canada—all of which are able to provide farm export credit over a period of more than 3 years.

The second major provision of the bill would remove restrictions on the granting of Government farm export credit to nonmarket-economy nations. This new access to our capital would undoubtedly provide encouragement to those countries to buy our farm products, especially in times of oversupply. The export credit sales program has already met with success in Eastern Europe. Because three Eastern European states are exempt from the restrictions, short-term commercial credit granted in that region reached \$250 million just 2 years ago. Potential for continued sales there is good because the traditional supplier—the Soviet Union—is not nearly as reliable as the United States. Of course, the huge economies of the Soviet Union and China and the industrialized economies of East Germany and Czechoslovakia have an even greater potential to absorb our farm products. I should point out

that the extension of farm export credit to Communist nations—already a part of our policy—does not give those nations a "free ride" at our expense. They must meet high standards of credit worthiness just as other customers do. I should also point out that there is no law of politics to the effect that the best interests of traditional adversaries cannot sometimes be served together. In the final analysis, our failure to enter the food markets of the populous Communist nations is a disservice to ourselves alone. They will get the food they want from suppliers in the West, but we will not get their business.

Mr. Speaker, we know how important farm exports are and what must be done to increase them. The Agricultural Trade Expansion Act addresses a genuine need in a straightforward way. I commend the bill to the attention of my colleagues. I urge that you consider it carefully. ●

WYDLER FORECASTS "ATOMIC SPUTNIK"

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), ranking minority member of our Science and Technology Committee, recently had discussions on nuclear energy with leading Soviet experts in Moscow and Kiev.

Upon his return, Mr. WYDLER wrote President Carter of his concern that this country has fallen behind in breeder reactor development and is slipping into second place in the nuclear club behind the U.S.S.R.

Although Mr. WYDLER and I do have some differences of opinion on what constitutes a strong breeder program, I feel that his letter makes for valuable reading. It is important that all the Members of the House have the benefit of Mr. WYDLER's perspective as the Congress prepares once again to vote on funding for nuclear technology development.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. WYDLER's letter to the President for the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, D.C., April 4, 1978.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Today I am writing you from the perspective of a series of international energy discussions which I have just had with the Soviets. It is no exaggeration to say that we are on the verge of an "Atomic Sputnik" in terms of our nuclear policy vis-a-vis the Soviets. They are rapidly moving to build breeder reactor plants and deploy light water nuclear power plants so as to put us clearly in second place in the nuclear league. In particular, I discussed the status of breeder reactor development with Mr. Igor Morozov, Deputy Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Atomic Energy. As you know, the critical question of which direction the U.S. Breeder program will take is before our Science and Technology Commit-

tee this week. I hope this letter will provide you additional insight on why our Committee is still concerned about the absence of a strong commitment in the U.S. program.

I am pleased that you have initiated an effort to come to some accommodation with the Congress on the breeder program and the Clinch River Reactor Project in particular. I share your view, as Secretary Schlesinger has related it, that continued confrontation on this issue is not in the best interest of the country. Chairman Teague has told me that you do feel that our nation needs a strong breeder program.

The fact is, however, that our program cannot really be strong without a demonstration of fast breeder technology in an operating plant. This plant does not have to be the one currently planned for Clinch River, but could incorporate more advanced breeder technology. However, until we make a larger commitment, we must keep the Clinch River Plant option open!

I have come to this conclusion about the breeder after my discussion last week with the Soviets in Moscow. I have also had extensive discussions with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna and the French Atomic Energy Commission, all within the past year. In all cases the evidence is irrefutable. Other major developed nations are far ahead of us in breeder development. Our continuing technology program is simply not sufficient to keep this energy option open to the United States in a timely manner!

The Russians have no intention of slowing their already ambitious breeder program. They have been operating a 350 Megawatt plant on the Caspian Sea; this "Clinch River" plant has been on line for over 3 years. They plan to complete and begin operation of a 600 Megawatt plant in 1980. Thus within the next several years they will have accumulated operating experience of 6-8 years on two different breeder plant designs. Mr. Morozov told me that design of a 1600 Megawatt plant is about to begin and construction will start in the next few years. The Soviets expect that it will take only 7 years to build this commercial-sized plant!

Mr. President, I think you will agree that the Soviets are much farther down the road toward the breeder option than ourselves particularly when one considers the stringent U.S. requirements on breeder licensing. I'm afraid our fall-back position of an R. & D. Program is simply not enough. As we found in our space program, it is not enough to merely design successively more powerful rockets—one must build and fly them as well. We must tell the world we are a strong player in breeder development, and the only convincing way to do that is to build a plant and make a visible national commitment. The Russians' timetable calls for operation of a commercial size breeder reactor by as early as 1987. We cannot guarantee operation of the Clinch River Plant, which is far from commercial, by that date even if we "pulled out all the stops" on that project.

It is necessary, but not sufficient, to merely say that the United States will pursue a strong breeder program. That is a commitment to nothing. We cannot expect the Russians, French, British, Germans or Japanese to take it seriously. Mr. President, we either play the breeder ball game or become a spectator. What we have now, even if we keep the Clinch River team together, is only "half a program."

I think it is also important to tell you something about the Soviet commitment to light water reactor technology. The Soviets have decided to build and rely completely on nuclear-electric plants west of the Urals in the European sector of the USSR. This decision is based on the fact the Soviets are running out of oil, gas and good coal. Dr.

Stanovmik of the Economic Commission of Europe said the Soviets have informed Eastern Bloc nations that they cannot count on any oil, and only on limited amounts of gas from the USSR. If one looks at Siberia as having potentially more resources than Alaska, I think it is inescapable to conclude that we face even a bleaker future than the Soviets for fossil fuel supplies. Yet we are limping indecisively on the nuclear option.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine told me in Kiev that they will complete six large nuclear power plants in the next five years or so. The first unit is already on-line and facilities will be completed to reprocess nuclear fuel on-site to recover the precious energy stored in the uranium and plutonium.

I understand that you plan to make a strong public statement on the need to speed the deployment of light water reactors. I urge you to do so in the very near future so as to improve the climate for public acceptance of nuclear power. Your licensing bill was an important first step in this direction and I applaud you for it. I hope that you can accelerate a nuclear waste management program in the light of the recent DOE report on this issue. The technology for safe disposal of waste exists; the country is waiting for a program which matches the technology.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that you have brought about solidly constructive evaluation of the real concerns about nuclear weapon proliferation since last April. However, I believe that two basic facts remain unchanged. First, our cutback of the breeder program and lack of commitment to build a fast reactor plant is a clear signal to other nations that we are not serious about preserving this long-term option. Second, this country's indication that nuclear power is "a last resort" has undermined our credibility abroad and made us an unreliable nuclear partner. I think it has become clear that it should not require the arresting of our technology development to address your proliferation concerns.

The Soviets contend that they are just as serious as the United States about preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons but "collective decisions" must be made on safeguards.

The CIVEX process appears an attractive route to blunting the terrorist threat for atomic weapons by a diversion-resistant fuel cycle for breeders. Reprocessing of light water reactor fuel could proceed in the near future under strict U.S. safeguards. Such activity could serve as a demonstration of U.S. concerns to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and a basis for international safeguards agreements.

The Soviets clearly recognize the urgency of pursuing the breeder option based on world uranium reserves, common sense economics and the need for some degree of energy independence from fossil fuels. However, their goals for nuclear power go beyond the generation of electricity. The Soviets intend to satisfy one-third of all their energy requirements for heat and electricity thru nuclear power by the end of the century. They feel so confident about this that they are promising Eastern European nations all the electricity that these countries will require for future decades. The ambitious building program for atomic plants in the Ukraine is dramatic evidence of this commitment. I think you will agree that our own program pales beside the Soviets despite our clear need and technological edge. It is frightening to speculate on the degree of control of the world market they might achieve by implementing this program.

Mr. President, I think it is time we moved ahead on the nuclear option. We have spent

the last year rethinking our nuclear future. We must now commit strongly to breeder technology including a demonstration plant to get valuable operating experience. We must also get many more nuclear power plants in place so that coal can be converted to critically needed liquids and gas. I hope you will move ahead boldly on both these fronts.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. WYDLER,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee
on Science and Technology. ●

LOUIS SIDOLI—CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, community involvement and public participation are the cornerstones upon which democracy stands and upon which our quality of life and social development depend. If anyone personifies these two qualities it is Mr. Louis Sidoli of Hamden, Conn., who is being named by the Hamden Italian-American Independent Club as its 1978 "Citizen of the Year." It is with great pride and appreciation that I join them in recognizing this fine community leader for his many outstanding contributions and endless generosity to the New Haven area for over 50 years.

A native of New York City, Mr. Sidoli attended the Seminary College, Bedonia, Parma, Italy, for 4 years. He was active in the wholesale beverage business from 1933 to 1962 and in 1965 became a director of the Hamden National Bank under its 1964 charter. He currently serves as director and consultant to that bank, which is now known as the American National Bank.

Over the years Mr. Sidoli has left a trail of accomplishments behind him and has received innumerable awards and citations from various civic, business, and educational organizations. His good will spread throughout the world and in 1954 he was made a Knight Commander in the Order of St. Sylvester. He was accorded this honor by the late Pope Pius XII for his many efforts and contributions toward the establishment of a home for the aged and orphans in Bedonia, Italy, near Parma, the home of his parents.

In 1957 he was the recipient of the Star of Solidarity from the Italian Government, followed by the Charles Carroll of Carrollton Award in 1958 from the John Barry General Assembly, 4th Degree, Knights of Columbus. He was again recognized in 1961 by the Italian Government when he was named Knight Commander of the Order of St. Agatha, San Marino, Italy, and was decorated a Knight, order of Merit by the Government.

His work in the community continued to receive acclaim throughout the sixties as he received the Veritas Award in 1965 from the Providence College New Haven Alumni Club and made a grand officer

for the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem, as well as a Knight Commander of the Italian Republic. Notre Dame University paid tribute to his service by awarding him the Golden Dome Award, and he was later named "Man of the Year" by the New Haven Evening Lions and the Humanitarian Award from the Knights of St. Patrick.

Mr. Sidoli remains active in the New Haven community and is presently State deputy of the Knights of Columbus, having served as their State treasurer and secretary. He is also a charter member and one of the founders of the Carmel Council of the Knights of Columbus in Hamden and assistant venerable of the New Haven Lodge No. 37, Sons of Italy. In addition, he is a former chairman of the Hamden Board of fire commissioners, and member of the board of finance of the State Labor Department's employment security board of review. He has also served St. Raphael's Hospital, Albertus Magnus College, Quinnipiac College, Sacred Heart Academy, the Boys Town of Italy, and the Italian Legion of Merit in various capacities.

Indeed, it is rare in life that you find one who so selflessly gives of himself for the betterment of others. In a well-deserved tribute the community of Hamden is recognizing this gentleman, and it is with pleasure that I join them in applauding his commendable efforts.●

HOW UNITED STATES IS HELPING IN HUGE ARMS BUILDUP BY SAUDI ARABIA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the United States is helping transform Saudi Arabia into "one of the leading military powers in the entire Middle East," according to an article in the April 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Dozens of American corporations, hundreds of U.S. Government employees, and thousands of American civilian technicians are conducting this transformation, on which the Saudis may be spending as much as \$30 billion or more by the mid-1980's.

Northrop Corp. is, in effect, operating the Royal Saudi Air Force; Raytheon Co., the missile air defense system; Avco Corp., the Saudi Coast Guard; Bendix, the Ordnance and Transport Corps; Vinnell Corp., the Saudi National Guard; and, of course, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is in charge of billions of dollars worth of military, military-related, and civilian construction.

We are building not only a viable military force for the Saudis but a national infrastructure as well. And it is being financed by our purchases of oil, which the Saudis have quadrupled in price over the past several years.

America has an important national interest in good relations with its leading source of foreign oil, but I have serious questions about the nature of that

relationship. I do not believe it is in our best interest or the Saudis' best interest to see that nation transferred into a military power. It is one thing to protect an immensely valuable natural resource, but it is another matter to help change a country from backbench cheerleader and financier to frontline confrontation state in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Saudi Arabia has never been a significant participant in previous Arab-Israeli wars, though it has sent soldiers and equipment. But with the multibillion influx of U.S. arms, it will be difficult if not impossible for the Saudis to stay out of any future wars.

At the very least, the Saudi role would be similar to that suggested in the U.S. News article:

... it could well play a key role as armorer for the Arabs who will have to shoulder the burdens of any fighting.

In my opinion, however, Saudi Arabia will have a difficult task confining its role solely to being the Arab arsenal. I suspect it will have a much larger role, whether it wishes to or not, particularly for its air force.

Saudi Arabia is not a tiny nation. It has more than double the population of Israel, its land mass is nearly 80 times larger, and its wealth is immensely greater.

Now the administration wants to sell Saudi Arabia 60 of our finest first-line advanced fighter aircraft—the F-15. These are to replace 37 British Lightning interceptors. A Pentagon study originally recommended selling only 40 replacement aircraft, and the Saudis agreed, asking for F-15's. The request was later increased, however, to 60 planes, and the administration accepted it. That number is 50 percent more than the amount of F-15's Israel would be permitted to purchase after the administration reduced Israel's request.

The Saudi Air Force does not need the F-15. This sale, in light of the across-the-board Saudi military buildup in general and the expansion of its air bases near Israel in particular, further threatens to alter significantly the balance of power in the Middle East and increase the danger to Israel. It raises important questions about the feasibility of Israeli withdrawal from its Sinai air base near Eilat at a time when Saudi Arabia is enlarging its own air base at Tabuk only a few minutes flying time to the southeast.

I am inserting in the Record at this point the U.S. News & World Report article on the Saudi buildup. This information should prove useful in the coming debate over the administration's Middle East aircraft sales proposals:

HOW UNITED STATES IS HELPING IN HUGE ARMS BUILDUP BY SAUDI ARABIA—A GROWING POWER

GUNS, PLANES AND TANKS MADE IN THE UNITED STATES FORM THE MILITARY MUSCLE, BUT THAT'S ONLY PART OF AMERICA'S OVERALL ROLE

DHAKHAN, SAUDI ARABIA.—An impressive combination of U.S. weapons and American know-how is helping turn this thinly populated kingdom into one of the leading military powers in the entire Middle East.

Billions of dollars' worth of U.S.-built planes, tanks, guns and other equipment are providing a much needed punch to a Saudi military machine charged with defending a country of about 7.5 million people in an area the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River.

The flow of military purchases from the U.S.—which could cost as much as \$10 billion dollars during the decade that will end in 1984—is only part of the American connection here.

Hundreds of U.S. military advisers and thousands of civilians on the scene are engaged in a massive effort to modernize the Saudi armed forces.

Behind the tremendous push to develop a modern military force:

The conservative and firmly anti-Communist Saudis consider it necessary to keep pace with potential rivals in the Persian Gulf area—notably Iraq, ruled by radicals, and Iran, governed by a conservative Shah now but with an unpredictable future.

The Saudis also keep a wary eye on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Riyadh's direct involvement in possible future wars is considered unlikely, but it could well play a key role as armorer for the Arabs who will have to shoulder the burden of any fighting.

Finally, the Saudis are deeply concerned about Soviet activities in areas close to this kingdom. Moscow's decision to pour millions of dollars in arms into Ethiopia for a war with Somalia, plus the Cuban involvement in the fighting are cited here as evidence of the need to stay on guard against Communist expansion in the region.

However, the Defense Minister, Prince Sultan bin Abdul Aziz, says Saudia Arabia has no intention of creating a large military establishment. That would hardly be feasible in a country with such a small population. The Army now numbers only 40,000.

What the Saudis are actually planning to build is a highly mobile Army with a strong mechanized and airborne capability. They also envisage a powerful Air Force and a sophisticated missile-defense system.

Currently, the Army consists of a single armored brigade, four infantry brigades and three artillery battalions, backed up by 300 AMX-30 French tanks and 250 American M-60 tanks. The Air Force has 110 Northrop F-5E's and 37 obsolete British Lightning interceptors. It hopes to augment those squadrons with 60 highly sophisticated U.S.-built McDonnell Douglas F-15s in the early 1980s.

CRITICS IN CONGRESS

There are serious doubts, as of now, whether Congress will O.K. the F-15 deal even though President Carter has given the green light. Congressional critics fear the new aircraft could tilt the military balance against Israel in the future.

Heart of the American military presence in Saudi Arabia is the mission headed by Air Force Brig. Gen. Carl H. Cathey, Jr. Some 250 uniformed U.S. advisers are training Saudi officers in a wide range of activities—from converting infantry to armor, to instructing combat pilots.

The mission includes another 750 Department of Defense civilians who train Saudis in the use and maintenance of the M-60 tanks. Naval officers also are assisting in the development of a 2,000-man, 28-vessel Navy.

The mission is only part of the total American involvement in the country's military buildup. In all, there are more than 6,000 U.S. civilian contract workers here engaged in a variety of assignments. For example:

More than 1,000 Northrop Corporation personnel help support the F-5E aircraft program. Raytheon Company assists in the deployment of the Hawk surface-to-air missile system.

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation is prime adviser on radar. Avco Corporation is working with the Coast Guard, Bendix Corporation with the Ordnance and Transport Corps.

Vinnell Corporation of California has contracts for one of the larger operations—a 77-million-dollar effort to strengthen the 26,000-man National Guard, the internal-security force responsible for protecting the oil fields and the royal family.

ENGINEERING EXPERTISE

The largest venture of all may be the huge construction program for which the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible. Total outlays for corps-directed projects could run as high as 17 billion dollars over a 10-year span.

Some 82 Army engineers and about 800 civilians—all paid by the Saudis—comprise the engineering contingent. In addition, the corps is responsible for subcontracting projects to civilian firms such as Bechtel Corporation, Fluor Corporation, Santa Fe Engineering, Lockheed, Raytheon, J. A. Jones, Blount Brothers and Aramco. To date, American companies have won some 43 percent of the contracts.

Actually, much of the work overseen by the corps is military only in a technical sense.

Morrison-Knudsen, for example, is helping to build a cantonment at Al Batin, northwest of Dhahran. The project calls for construction of facilities for 6,500 troops and their families, including schools, hospitals, mosques and markets. Eventually, Al Batin is expected to grow into a community of 70,000, with total construction costs running up to 7 billion dollars.

The U.S. is not the only Western power that the Saudis are calling on for help. France and Britain also have training missions here. But they are small compared with the tremendous American presence that shows every sign of becoming even larger in years ahead. ●

HOW OUR POLICY TOWARD NUCLEAR POWER BENEFITS THE KREMLIN

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a firm policy toward nuclear power by the United States and the attempts to somehow try and prevent other nations from developing nuclear power technology indirectly benefit the Soviet Union. This was discussed in the Evans and Novak column in the Washington Post today. It is pointed out that the formidable, richly financed anti-nuclear lobby (with its agents deeply ensconced inside the Carter administration) may cause the West to fall permanently behind the Communist bloc in nuclear power development.

The column reads as follows:

HOW OUR NUCLEAR POLICY BENEFITS THE KREMLIN

Partly obscured behind the shock waves of President Carter's neutron "bomb" decision, a crisis on nuclear power is building in the Western alliance over the creeping U.S. embargo against export of raw material for nuclear power plants, with the Soviet Union benefiting directly.

The limit on exporting U.S.-produced enriched uranium comes out of the new Nuclear Nonproliferation Act, with this unintended result: Soviet nuclear power becomes preeminent. Since breeder-reactor technology is regarded by oil-starved Europe as vital to future energy needs, our European allies may turn eastward for their enriched uranium and technology exchange.

Even without the new act, the president's abhorrence of the breeder reactor points to Soviet domination—as was pointed out in a confidential letter delivered to Carter April 4 from Rep. John W. Wyder of New York. The senior Republican on the House Science Committee, Wyder warned the president that "it is frightening to speculate on the degree of control of the world market [for breeder-produced nuclear power] that the Soviet Union might achieve by implementing" its fast-moving nuclear power program.

Economic and political stakes in the rush for nuclear energy by the Western democracies and Japan are awesome. Considering that, the Carter administration's nuclear nonpolicy could contribute to another global victory for the expansive masters of the Kremlin.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Act, signed into law March 10 by Carter, adds to the danger. It gives the nine Western European countries who belong to EURATOM 30 days to start negotiations with the United States. The law bans U.S. exports of enriched uranium to Western Europe unless EURATOM agrees to U.S. control over spent fuel manufactured in European plants.

That is vitally important, giving Washington veto power over reprocessing spent fuel and, hence, over Europe's power to build breeder nuclear power plants. The breeder, making its own fuel as it manufactures power, is nearly indispensable to Europe's future power needs.

This unilateral change in existing agreements dating back to the mid-'60s infuriated the European nations. Forced to play the high-stakes nuclear power game the Washington way, their first reaction was symbolic retaliation. With the French taking the lead, they simply ignored the provision in the new U.S. law giving them 30 days to start negotiations for new licenses to import enriched uranium.

The EURATOM nations will surely agree, probably soon, to negotiate new enriched-uranium contracts. But thumbing their noses at starting the talks within the 30 days is a symbol of their anger.

Carter's deeply rooted fear is that reprocessed fuel—which is weapons-grade fuel—could be turned illegally into bombs. That is understandable when considered in a political vacuum. Unfortunately, however, the Soviet Union has no parallel concerns. The Soviets are far ahead of the breeder reactor curve today and picking up ever more speed.

Rep. Wyder drafted his warning to the president after talks with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, the French Atomic Energy Commission and finally with the Russians in Moscow last month. A congressional expert on nuclear power, Wyder predicted to Carter that we are "on the verge of an atomic Sputnik"—a sudden Soviet advance.

He warned the president that his opposition to the Clinch River experimental breeder reactor signals all other nations that the United States is not serious about preserving the breeder as a long-range option; that has undermined U.S. nuclear power credibility abroad "and made us an unreliable nuclear partner."

Over Carter's protest, Congress has kept the Clinch River "breeder" from dying a premature death. But that does not relieve the president from getting his act together and

taking on the formidable, richly financed anti-nuclear lobby (with its equally formidable agents ensconced as officials deep inside his administration). Otherwise, the West may be doomed to fall behind the communist bloc, never to recover.

For example, the Soviets now operate a 350-megawatt experimental "breeder" on the Caspian Sea and will complete a 600-megawatt plant in 1980. Design is beginning for a 1,600-megawatt plant, which the Russians told Wyder would take only seven years to build.

No wonder, then, that the new law limiting export of U.S. enriched uranium is creating consternation. Following EURATOM's symbolic refusal to start new talks within the 30-day period, West Germany will soon increase its purchase of enriched uranium from the Russians. More attacks on the exposed flank of President Carter's nuclear power policy will surely follow. ●

THE B-1 GHOST; THE MISTAKE WHICH WILL COME TO HAUNT THE CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the President and, now, unfortunately, the Congress have made a serious mistake in halting the B-1 program.

I could accept the decision to terminate the B-1 program, if in fact, there were more cost-effective alternatives. My difficulty is in finding a single defense witness who will testify that this is the case. In the Department of Defense Bomber Modernization Study of April 29, 1977, the alternatives to the B-1 are described at length. Adding up the cost of these alternatives—the B-52 modernization program, the FB-111H, the cruise missile carrier and its complement of cruise missiles—you arrive at a grand total of nearly \$26 billion. Each of these alternatives has been presented to the Congress as viable programs for which funding has been requested by the Department of Defense. I ask my colleagues to recall the fact that the total cost for completion of the entire B-1 program was about \$18 billion. These "more cost-effective" alternatives will cost the American taxpayer about \$10 billion more than the total cost of the B-1 program.

The evidence is rather clear that we will be building a follow-on manned strategic aircraft in the coming years. To date, we have spent over \$7 billion developing a follow-on to the B-52, an aircraft described by the then Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Brown, on January 25, 1966, as a bomber which would be obsolete by 1975. Most importantly, if we initiate another research and development program to build a follow-on bomber, we will place a burden of some \$5 billion or more on the American taxpayers and produce an aircraft that is identical to the B-1 in design and performance.

I submit for the RECORD, a copy of a letter recently received from Mr. Bob Anderson, president, Rockwell International, detailing the testing of the already built B-1 aircraft, and second, describing the additional layoffs necessitated by the decision of the House to halt work on aircraft No. 5 and No. 6.

Copy of letter follows:

ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL,
April 3, 1978.

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: We at Rockwell International Corporation have appreciated your support for the B-1 program during these past seven years of development and want to thank you for your efforts to retain aircraft No. 5 and No. 6 in the flight test program.

Because of the House vote on February 22 the Los Angeles Division was forced to lay off 750 employees immediately. Lay off of an additional 2,250 will occur during the rest of the year as completion of the fourth B-1 nears in Palmdale, reducing employment at the Los Angeles Division to 3,500 by the end of the year. We have established a vocational counseling and job relocation center at the Rockwell Recreation Center in Los Angeles to assist those laid off in securing other employment.

I continue to believe that B-1 is the key to the perpetuation and modernization of the manned penetrator as the third leg of the TRIAD. We look forward to continuing the four aircraft research and development program through 1983. At the Los Angeles Division, to date, aircraft No. 1 through No. 3 have flown a total of 950 hours. We have completed six inert and two live SRAM launches and met or exceeded Air Force specifications in every instance. We expect to complete aircraft No. 4 early next year and begin its flight testing. Aircraft No. 4 will demonstrate and flight test the most complete and up-to-date offensive and defensive avionics systems in existence.

Both Buz Hello and Doc Blalock have asked me to convey to you their appreciation for your strong endorsement of the B-1 program in the past. We hope we can continue to count on your support for the four aircraft B-1 research and development program this year and in the future.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ANDERSON,
President, Rockwell International. ●

"DIRTY DOZEN": A DISCREDITED RATING SYSTEM

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1978

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is that time of the year again when various groups begin to issue ratings of Members, based on selected votes. These ratings can be very important for a Member because of the image they can convey to constituents and supporters, and because of the usually uncritical manner in which the media accepts and plays up these ratings.

No Member will object to a rating that is an accurate portrayal of a legislative

record, and is based on appropriate votes. Unfortunately, however, some groups seem more interested in enhancing or damaging certain Members and so seek votes that will support their particular political bias without much regard for the accuracy of the image portrayed.

One such group is Environmental Action, which, as you know, has tried to do a job on me, as well as on a number of other Members. Last Saturday the Washington Post published an article by my good friend and distinguished colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), in which he very cogently describes the blatantly political manner in which this group develops its ratings.

He also describes the manner in which the media have swallowed virtually whole the propaganda of this group without questioning the way in which its ratings are developed.

JIM CLEVELAND's article is eloquent testimony to the need for someone to ask "who is rating the raters?" I commend it to my colleagues for their reading and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1978]

"DIRTY DOZEN": A DISCREDITED RATING SYSTEM

(By James C. Cleveland)

A group known as Environmental Action will soon issue its 1978 "Dirty Dozen" list of House members whose defeat it seeks on allegedly environmental grounds. Response by the press, if it repeats past performance, will be mixed. Most reporting will serve as the uncritical conduit for the charges, while some will provide probing news coverage and commentary discrediting the accusations and their source.

I observed both varieties of coverage as a member of the Dirty Dozen in 1976, which leads me to suggest that, next time around, the press stiffen its skepticism in handling political material from Environmental Action.

After the last election, National Journal's Michael J. Malbin examined charges by House Minority Leader John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.), also on the 1976 list, that rating procedures of most groups were unfair and Environmental Action was the worst offender. Reviewing materials assembled by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee for a symposium on political rating groups, he concluded that they tend to support Rhodes' charges.

As to the press, Malbin observed, "the problem with all this is that it is easy in the heat of a political campaign for an opponent—or the news media—to latch onto a label and assume that there is something solid behind it." Added Chris Black, Washington correspondent of the Lowell (Mass.) Sun:

"The 'Dirty Dozen campaign' plays upon institutional weaknesses in the press. The gimmicky charge receives page-one play but the denial is buried on the obituary page. And the group uses the widespread assumption that environmental groups are somehow above politics and reproach, although Dirty Dozen proved to be quite different from this perception."

Unintended distortion came with initial coverage strongly suggesting that the 12 on the list were selected on the basis of their environmental voting records. That impression was conveyed by AP, UPI, The Washington Star and particularly The Post which plugged that line in its headline and lead paragraph. Yet those vote rankings were ab-

solutely meaningless in Environmental Action's own selection process. I made the list although more than 100 others voted equally "wrong" or worse on the votes used. Environmental Action itself concedes that other factors are considered, a fact scarcely alluded to in Washington coverage.

A key factor was vulnerability. Environmental Action argued that it didn't waste time going after occupants of safe seats. But had reporters examined that factor, they would have learned that eight members of the 1976 list won elections in 1974 with a scant 53 percent of the vote or less; one won his 1974 primary with only 55 percent of the vote and the general election with 53 percent, and faced another tough primary in 1976. Those members aren't just unsafe; they're the walking wounded.

Rhodes blasted the ratings, requesting the Fair Campaign Practices Committee to monitor and expose the unfairness involved. That received prominent, fair and balanced coverage in Washington and presumably elsewhere. Later, the press here and across the country gave good exposure to a study entitled "The Rating Game," by the House Republican Research Committee, which for all its overtly partisan origin was an excellent critique of rating groups in general and Environmental Action in particular.

Meanwhile, one of the most perceptive pieces I saw on an individual member was done by Paul Houston of the Los Angeles Times in the case of Burt Talcott (R-Calif.). He found "considerable evidence that, in placing Talcott on the list, Environmental Action had accused Talcott wrongly on several points." Houston added that "there is some merit to his claim that his low Environmental Action rating, which was based on 14 selected votes among dozens last year, distorted his record." (Talcott lost anyway, one of the three on the list to do so.)

Easily the worst in terms of swallowing Dirty Dozen propaganda whole were a patty-cake piece in The New Yorker and a column by Clayton Fritchey, appearing in The Post, which rhapsodized that the Dirty Dozen gimmick ought to be adopted by other interest groups.

In New Hampshire, my designation as one of the Dirty Dozen received prominent play that ultimately proved not damaging. Three solid editorials in New Hampshire dailies bracketing the political spectrum denounced my selection as a dirty deed. Then Chris Black of the Lowell Sun exposed the fact that the Dirty Dozen campaign coordinator had worked for my opponent-to-be in a McGovern campaign. They had discussed the list at least a month before it was issued with the general understanding that I would be included only if he were likely to run. Environmental Action claimed it was misquoted.

My opponent made no issue of the Dirty Dozen or my environmental record in the campaign; he walked away from the issue, saying the Dirty Dozen Campaign Committee was doing its own thing. (I later won with 61 percent of the vote.)

In New Hampshire, Environmental Action's remaining credibility died. The group claimed to have enlisted a number of environmental organizations against me. That made headlines, as did subsequent disclosure that the claim was phony. (Environmental Action again claimed it was misquoted.)

Environmental Action seeks to be a continuing and credible presence on the scene, though it consists mainly of a magazine staff of roughly a dozen, lobbies sporadically and ineffectively, and has no membership. Its political operation is a floating media event. It thus deserves scrutiny in its own right in the interests of a cleaner political environment. ●